



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 30] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 24, 1976/भाद्रपद 2, 1898  
No. 30] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 24, 1976/SRAVANA 2, 1898

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके  
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

### भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)  
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities  
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय  
(कार्यिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2691.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तथा भारतीय लेखापरीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में सेवा करने वाले व्यक्तियों के संबंध में, नियंत्रक और महालेखापरीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) तृतीय संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 18 के उप-नियम (1) को उस नियम के खण्ड (I) के रूप में पुनः संख्यांकित किया जाएगा, और

(क) इस प्रकार तथा पुनः संख्यांकित खण्ड (I) में,—

(i) आरम्भिक पैरा में, “और तत्पश्चात् ऐसे अन्तरालों पर, जो सरकार द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट किए जाएं” शब्दों का लोप किया जाएगा;

(ii) टिप्पण 3 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित टिप्पण रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“टिप्पण 3 जहां ऐसे सरकारी सेवक को, जो पहले से ही किसी सेवा का है या कोई पद धारण कर रहा है, किसी अन्य सिविल सेवा या पद पर नियुक्त किया जाता है, वहां उससे इस खण्ड के अधीन नई विवरणी प्रस्तुत करने की अपेक्षा नहीं की जाएगी।”

(ख) इस प्रकार यथा पुनः संख्यांकित खण्ड (I) जिसके अन्तर्गत उसके टिप्पण भी आते हैं के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित खण्ड अन्तः स्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

(ii) किसी सेवा का, या समूह का अथवा समूह ख में सम्मिलित कोई पद धारण करने वाला, हर एक सरकारी सेवक ऐसे प्रारूप में जो सरकार द्वारा इस बाबत विहित किया जाए, एक वार्षिक विवरणी प्रस्तुत करेगा जिसमें उस स्थावर सम्पत्ति के बारे में पूर्ण विशिष्टियां दी जाएंगी जो उसने विरासत में प्राप्त की हो या उसके स्वामित्व में हो या उसने अर्जित की हों अथवा जो उसके द्वारा पट्टे या बंधक पर या तो अपने नाम में या अपने कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य के नाम में या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति के नाम में धारित हो।

[संख्या 11013/19/75-स्थापना(प)]

आर० सी० गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

## CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

**S.O. 2691.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Third Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. Sub-rule (1) of rule 18 of the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, shall be re-numbered as clause (i) thereof and —

(a) in clause (i) as so re-numbered, —

(i) in the opening paragraph, the words “and thereafter at such intervals as may be specified by the Government” shall be omitted;

(ii) for Note 3, the following Note shall be substituted, namely :—

“Note 3.—Where a Government servant already belonging to a service or holding a post is appointed to any other civil service or post, he shall not be required to submit a fresh return under this clause”;

(b) after clause (i) as so re-numbered (including the Notes thereto), the following clause shall be inserted, namely :—

“(ii) Every Government servant belonging to any service or holding any post included in Group A or group B shall submit an annual return in such form as may be prescribed by the Government in this regard giving full particulars regarding the immovable property inherited by him or owned or acquired by him or held by him on lease or mortgage either in his own name or in the name of any member of his family or in the name of any other person.”

[No. 11013/19/75-Estts(A)]

R. C. GUPTA, Under Secy.

## वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बैंककारी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1976

## प्राय-कर

क्र० आ० 2692.—प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. अधिसूचना सं० 1083 (फा० सं० 404/103/75 आई० टी० सी०) तारीख 17-9-1975, सं० 416 (फा० सं० 404/128/73 आई० टी० सी०) तारीख 9-7-73 और सं० 130 (फा० सं० 404/235/72

आई० टी० सी०) तारीख 30-6-72 के अधीन की गई क्रमशः सर्वश्री बी० के० गुप्ता, एम० एम० राजोरिया और एम० एम० मित्तल की नियुक्ति सर्वश्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा के कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से रद्द की जाती है।

3. यह अधिसूचना श्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा के कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 1354 (फा० सं० 404/41/76-आई० टी० सी०)]

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue and Banking)

New Delhi, the 11th June, 1976

## INCOME-TAX

**S.O. 2692.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma who are Gazetted Officers of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officers under the said Act.

2. The appointments of S/Shri V. K. Gupta, M. S. Rajoria and N. L. Mittal made in Notification No. 1083 F. No. 404/103/75-ITCC dated 17-9-1975 No. 416 (F. No. 404/128/73-ITCC) dated 9-7-73 and No. 130 (F. No. 404/235/72-ITCC) dated 30-6-72 respectively are cancelled with effect from the date S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma take over charge as T.R.Os.

3. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma take over charge as T.R.Os.

[No. 1354 (F. No. 404/41/76-ITCC)]

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1976

## प्राय-कर

क्र० आ० 2693.—प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एस० एस० पिण्ड को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री एस० एस० पिण्ड के कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 1360 (फा० सं० 404/89/76-आई० टी० सी०)]

बी० पी० मित्तल, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1976

## INCOME-TAX

**S.O. 2693.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri S. S. Thind, who is a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri S. S. Thind takes over the charge of Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 1360 (F. No. 404/89/76-ITCC)]

V. P. MITTAL, Dy. Secy.

## (बैंकिंग पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1976

क्रा० प्रा० 2694.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि पहली जुलाई, 1976 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30 जून, 1978 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के दौरान —

(क) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपखण्ड (i) और (ii) के उपबन्ध नीचे लिखे बैंकों के मामलों में वहा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक कि वे उपबन्ध कथित बैंकों का प्रबन्ध उन व्यक्तियों द्वारा किये जाने का प्रतिषेध करते हैं, जोकि कम्पनी अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 1) के अधीन एक पंजीकृत कम्पनी "कृषिक वित्त निगम लि०" के निदेशक हैं; और

(ख) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्ध नीचे लिखे बैंकों के मामलों में वहां तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक कि वे उपबन्ध उक्त बैंकों के उपर्युक्त "कृषिक वित्त निगम लि०" के शेयर धारण करने का प्रतिषेध करते हैं।

क्रम सं०	बैंक का नाम
1.	सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया
2.	बैंक आफ इंडिया
3.	पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
4.	बैंक आफ बड़ौदा
5.	यूनाइटेड कमर्शियल बैंक
6.	यूनाइटेड बैंक आफ इंडिया
7.	यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया
8.	बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र
9.	सिंडिकेट बैंक
10.	देना बैंक

[सं० एफ० 13/3/76-ए० सी०]

हृषीकेश गुहा, अवसरसचिव

## (Banking Wing)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2694.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that, during the period commencing on the 1st July, 1976 and ending with the 30th June, 1978 —

(a) the provisions of sub-clauses (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the said Act

shall not apply to the undermentioned banks in so far as the said provisions prohibit the said banks from being managed by persons who are directors of the Agricultural Finance Corporation Ltd., a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956); and

(b) the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply to the undermentioned banks, in so far as the said provisions prohibit the said banks from holding shares in the said Agricultural Finance Corporation Limited.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bank
1.	Central Bank of India
2.	Bank of India
3.	Punjab National Bank
4.	Bank of Baroda
5.	United Commercial Bank
6.	United Bank of India
7.	Union Bank of India
8.	Bank of Maharashtra
9.	Syndicate Bank
10.	Dena Bank.

[No. F. 13-3/76-AC]

H. K. GUHA, Under Secy.

क्रा० प्रा० 2695.—क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री गणेश चन्द्र कलिता को प्राग्ज्योतिष गाम्बोलिया बैंक, नलबाड़ी का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 6 जुलाई, 1976 से आरंभ होकर 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसमें श्री गणेश चन्द्र कलिता अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 4-79/75 ए० सी० (4)]

सी० भार० विश्वास, उप सचिव

S.O. 2695.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Ganesh Chandra Kalita as the Chairman of the Pragjyotish Gaonlia Bank, Nalbari and specifies the period commencing on the 6th July, 1976 ending with the 31st December, 1976 as the period for which the said Shri Ganesh Chandra Kalita shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 4-79/75-AC (IV)]

C. R. BISWAS, Dy. Secy.

**भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक**  
**RESERVE BANK OF INDIA**

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जून 1976 के दिनांक 4 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा  
S.O. 2696.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 4th day of June, 1976

**इशू विभाग**  
**ISSUE DEPARTMENT**

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट Notes held in the Banking Department	19,81,66,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :— Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
संचालन में नोट Notes in circulation	7180,54,56,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ (a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट Total notes issued		7200,36,22,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ (b) Held outside India	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां Foreign Securities	371,73,97,000	
			जोड़ Total		554,26,48,000
			रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin		10,64,40,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां Government of India Rupee Securities		6635,45,34,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
कुल देयताएं Total Liabilities		7200,36,22,000	कुल आस्तियां Total Assets		7200,36,22,000

दिनांक 9 जून, 1976

Dated the 9th June, 1976

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

4 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण  
Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 4th June, 1976

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
शुद्धता पूंजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	19,81,66,000
आरक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	6,38,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	3,24,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	140,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(क) देशी (a) Internal	116,05,81,000
		(ख) विदेशी (b) External	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	390,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल (c) Government Treasury Bills	317,37,19,000
		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया Balances Held Abroad	1221,72,49,000

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
जमा राशियां Deposits :—		निवेश Investments	235,01,64,000
(क) सरकारी (a) Government		ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances to :—	..
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार (ii) Central Government	50,18,39,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को Central Government	
(ii) राज्य सरकारें (ii) State Governments	12,39,14,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	222,40,78,000
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		ऋण और अग्रिम — Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक Scheduled Commercial Banks	677,15,07,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को (i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	892,02,46,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	33,12,53,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	125,29,45,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,70,21,000	(iii) दूसरों को Others	42,85,93,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक Other Banks		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
	93,98,000	(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :— (a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को (i) State Governments	75,77,53,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को (ii) State Co-operative Banks	13,03,01,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को (iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम को Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,90,00,000
(ग) अन्य (c) Others	1876,22,52,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंक के डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,84,79,000
देय बिल Bills Payable	90,86,49,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	66,24,62,000
अन्य देयताएं Other Liabilities	897,34,05,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम Loans & Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम (a) Loans and Advances to the Development ment Banks	387,02,55,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		अन्य आस्तियां Other Assets	800,42,85,000
रुपये Rupees	4658,92,38,000	रुपये Rupees	4658,92,38,000

दिनांक 9 जून, 1976

Dated the 9th day of June, 1976

भार० के० हजारी, उप गवर्नर

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

[No. F.10/1/76-B.O.I.]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जून, 1976 के दिनांक 11 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा  
S.O. 2697.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 11th day of June 1976.

## इशू विभाग

## ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट Notes held in the Banking Department		24,53,79,000	सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :— Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
संचलन में नोट Notes in circulation		7314,72,68,000	(क) भारत में रखा हुआ (a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट Total notes issued		7339,26,47,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ (b) Held outside India	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां Foreign Securities	471,73,97,000	
			जोड़ Total		654,26,48,000
			रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin		9,55,36,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति- भूतियां Government of India Rupee Securities		6 675,44,63,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
कुल देयताएं Total Liabilities		7339,26,47,000	कुल आस्तियां Total Assets		7339,26,47,000

दिनांक 16 जून, 1976

Dated the 16th day of June, 1976

आर० के० शेषाद्री, उप गवर्नर

R. K. SESHADRI, Dy. Governor

11 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 11th June, 1976

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
चुक्ता पूंजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	24,53,79,000
भारक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	5,80,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	2,95,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	140,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(क) देशी (a) Internal	130,80,79,000
		(ख) विदेशी (b) External	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations)	390,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल (c) Government Treasury Bills	
		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया Balances Held Abroad	356,57,74,000
Fund			1184,15,23,000

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
जमा राशियां :— Deposits :— (क) सरकारी (a) Government		निवेश Investments	172,46,26,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार Central Government	56,96,36,000	ऋण और अधिम.— Loans and Advances to :—	
(ii) राज्य सरकारें State Governments	10,06,59,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को Central Government	
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		(ii) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	242,34,09,000
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक Scheduled Commercial Banks	7 21,46,42,000	ऋण और अधिम.— Loans and Advances to :—	
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	28,75,90,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को Scheduled Commercial Banks	982,51,77,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,85,45,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	115,44,59,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक Other Banks	71,88,000	(iii) दूसरों को Others	43,25,43,000
(ग) अन्य (c) Others		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण अधिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
देय बिल Bills Payable		(क) ऋण और अधिम.— (a) Loans and Advances to :—	
अन्य देयताएं Other Liabilities		(i) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	75,77,52,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	12,78,88,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम को Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,90,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,82,08,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	63,74,55,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अधिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम (a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	387,02,56,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		अन्य आस्तियां Other Assets	809,95,12,000
रुपये Rupees	4725,19,51,000	रुपये Rupees	4725,19,51,000

दिनांक 16 जून, 1976  
Dated the 16th day of June, 1976

आर० के० शेषाद्री, उप गवर्नर  
R. K. Shashadri, Dy. Governor  
[No. F./10/1/76—BO. I]  
सी० वल्लभू० मीरचन्दानी, अवर सचिव  
C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जून 1976 के दिनांक 18 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

S.O. 2698.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 18th day of June, 1976

हणू विभाग  
ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट Notes held in the Banking Department	35,34,60,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :— Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ (a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
संचलन में नोट Notes in circulation	7256,03,54,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ (b) Held outside India	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां Foreign Securities	546,73,97,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट Total notes issued		7291,38,14,000			
			जोड़ Total		729,26,48,000
			रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin		11,67,25,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति- भूतियां Government of India Rupee Securities		6550,44,41,000
			ऐसी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
कुल देयताएं Total Liabilities		7291,38,14,000	कुल आस्तियां Total Assets		7291,38,14,000

दिनांक 23 जून, 1976  
Dated the 23rd day of June, 1976

के० आर० पुरी, गवर्नर  
K. R. Puri, Governor

18 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 18th June, 1976

देयताएं LIABILITIES	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां ASSETS	रुपये Rs.
धुक्ता पूंजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	35,34,60,000
भारक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	4,44,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रचलन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	3,20,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabillsation) Fund	140,00,00,000	खरीदे और मुनाये गये बिल Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(क) देशी (a) Internal	141,82,30,000
		(ख) विदेशी (b) External	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रचलन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	390,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल (c) Government Treasury Bills	329,80,85,000
		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया Balances Held Abroad	1164,26,19,000



देयताएं LIABILITIES	रुपये Rs	आस्तििया ASSETS	रुपये Rs.
जमागणियां --- Deposits :—		निवेश Investments	156,16,08,000
(क) सरकारी (a) Government		ऋण और अग्रिम --- Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार Central Government	71,07,40,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को Central Government	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें State Governments	10,13,39,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	252,21,51,000
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		ऋण और अग्रिम --- Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक Scheduled Commercial Banks	740,54,14,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को Scheduled Commercial Banks	1040,90,77,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	27,48,40,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	127,56,89,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,64,89,000	(iii) दूसरों को Others	42,72,43,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक Other Banks	81,88,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from Na- tional Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :— (a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	75,76,10,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	12,47,38,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्निर्माण और विकास निगम को Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,70,00,000
(ग) अन्य (c) Others	1896,82,44,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,82,08,000
देय बिल Bills Payable	93,62,56,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
अन्य देयताएं Other Liabilities	906,74,89,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	64,99,51,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण अग्रिम और निवेश Loans Advances and Investments from Na- tional Industrial Credit (Long Term Opera- tions) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम (a) Loans and Advances to the Development Banks	387,02,56,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		अन्य आस्तियां Other Assets	813,23,10,000
रुपये Rupees	4767,89,99,000	रुपये Rupees	4767,89,99,000

दिनांक 23 जून, 1976

Dated the 23rd day of June, 1976

के. आर. पुरी, गवर्नर

K. R. PURI, Governor.

[No. F.10/1/76-BO-I]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

## आयकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, पटियाला II

पटियाला, 1 जुलाई, 1976

## (आय-कर)

क्रा० प्रा० 2699.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोक-हित में यह आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है कि 31-3-1976 को नौ मास में अधिक की अवधि के लिए 25,000 रु० अथवा उससे अधिक कर की अदायगी में चूक करने वाले व्यक्तियों से सम्बन्धित यहाँ इसके पश्चात् बिनिश्चित नाम तथा अन्य त्रिनिश्चित प्रकाशित की जाय —

और यत् आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 13) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 9 जून, 1969 द्वारा सभी आयकर आयुक्तों का वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के अंत में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर स्थित करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित नाम, बने तथा कर चुक की राशि प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक 9 जून, 1969 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इसमें सलग्न अनुसूची में पूर्वोक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य त्रिनिश्चित एवंद्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

## आय-कर विभाग, पटियाला

आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 287 के अधीन चुककर्ताओं की सूची जैसी 31-3-1976 को थी (i) चूक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो नौ मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए है परन्तु एक वर्ष और तीन मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए नहीं है, (ii) चूक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो एक वर्ष तीन मास की अवधि के लिए तथा उससे अधिक अवधि के लिए है परन्तु दो वर्ष और तीन मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए नहीं है, (iii) चूक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो दो वर्ष तीन मास की अवधि के लिए तथा उससे अधिक अवधि के लिए है; और (iv) चूक की कुल रकम के लिए है।

1. मैसर्स मलेरकोटवा बस सर्विस (प्रा०) लि०, मलेरकोटवा (iii) 61,418 रु० तथा (iv) 61,318 रु०।
2. मैसर्स प्रताप रोडवेज पटियाला—(iii) 37,971 रु० तथा (iv) 37,971 रु०।
3. मैसर्स तरवाना मोटर ट्रामपोट क० सामाना—(iii) 96,396 रु० तथा (iv) 96,396 रु०।
4. मैसर्स चिरजी लाल श्रोम प्रकाश, फरीदाबाद—(i) 1850 रु० (iii) 31,231 रु० तथा (iv) 33,081 रु०।
5. मैसर्स कैलाश जतरल स्टोर, भिवानी—(iii) 48,800 रु० तथा (iv) 48,800 रु०।
6. श्री भ्यास देव ढोगरा, मालिक मैसर्स ढोगरा स्टील, फरीदाबाद—(iii) 5,84,648 रु० तथा (iv) 5,84,648 रु०।
7. मैसर्स दी हाऊसहोल्ड एण्ड जतरल मिस्त्र, सोनीपत—(iii) 1,11,091 रु० तथा (iv) 1,11,091 रु०।
8. मैसर्स व ड्युक ब्रवर्स (प्रा०) लि०, अम्बाला कैट—(iii) 28,229 रु० तथा (iv) 28,229 रु०।
9. मैसर्स रोहतक डिस्ट्रिक्ट ट्रांसपोर्ट सोसाइटी, रोहतक—(iii) 26,969 रु० तथा (iv) 26,969 रु०।

10. मैसर्स न्यू राहतक भिवानी ट्रामपोट क०, रोहतक—(iii) 90,519 रु० तथा (iv) 90,519 रु०।
11. भरत जसवन्त मिश्र, अम्बाला शहर—(iii) 35,281 रु० तथा (iv) 35,281 रु०।
12. मैसर्स द कुलदीप आयल इन्डस्ट्रीज, प्रा० लि० अम्बाला कैट—(iii) 28,930 रु० तथा (iv) 28,930 रु०।
13. मैसर्स मिस्त्रसेन जैन एण्ड सन्ज, रोहतक—(iii) 31,893 रु० (iv) 31,893 रु०।
14. मैसर्स अनवारी लाल खलवन्त राय, निरमा—(iii) 97,738 रु० तथा (iv) 97,738 रु०।
15. मैसर्स सत तरायत, हरि कुमार, नालवा, डिस्ट्रिक्ट-भिवानी—(iii) 47,242 रु० तथा (iv) 47,242 रु०।
16. श्री एल० आर० टवेडिया, मार्फत मैसर्स फाइन वायर्ज (प्रा०) लि०, पलवल—(iii) 35,106 रु० तथा (iv) 35,406 रु०।
17. श्री केदारनाथ, सुपुत्र श्री दुर्गमल, गाँव गौद, तहसील-नारनौल—(iii) 73,298 रु० तथा (iv) 73,298 रु०।
18. मैसर्स जगप्रसाद तुलसी राम, पहलाव दण्ड नानक चन्द गाँव गद्दीबाजण, डिस्ट्रिक्ट रिवाड़ी—(iii) 1,04,731 रु० तथा (iv) 1,04,731 रु०।
19. मैसर्स सूरज भान दुली बन्व, जुमाना—(iii) 42,805 रु० तथा (iv) 42,805 रु०।
20. मैसर्स जनरल साहन्ज कैरिज एण्ड क०, चण्डी मन्दिर, डिस्ट्रिक्ट अम्बाला—(iii) 51,817 रु० तथा (iv) 51,817 रु०।
21. श्री इन्दरजीत सिंह साहनी, 268 एम० टी० सोनीपत—(iii) 60,841 रु० तथा (iv) 60,841 रु०।
22. मैसर्स शमिक मेटल प्रोडक्शन कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी, जगाधरी—(ii) 13,887 रु०, (iii) 70,910 रु० तथा (iv) 84,797 रु०।

[क्रा० सं० मुख्या० II-प्रका०/कर चुककर्ता/76-77/6]

Office of the Commissioner of Income tax, Patiala-II

Patiala-II, the 1st July, 1976

## INCOME-TAX

**S.O. 2699.**—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified, relating to persons in default of payment of tax of Rs. 25,000 or more for period exceeding nine months as on 31-3-1976:

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf the Central Government by its order dated 9th June, 1969 authorised all the Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses and the amount of tax in default relating to assesses within their jurisdiction as at the end of financial year 1975-76.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 9th June, 1969, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed, the names and other particulars of the assesses aforesaid.

## Income Tax Department, Patiala

List of defaulters on 31-3-1976 u/s 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (i) is for amount in default for periods exceeding nine months, but not exceeding one year and three months; (ii) for amount in default for periods of one year and three months and above but not exceeding two years and three months; (iii) for amount in default of two

years and three months and above; and (iv) for total amount in default.

1. M/s. Malekotla Bus Service (P) Ltd., Malekotla—(iii) Rs. 61,318 and (iv) Rs. 61,318.
2. M/s. Partap Roadways, Patiala—(iii) 37,971 and (iv) Rs. 37,971.
3. M/s. Narwana Motor Transport Co., Samana—(iii) Rs. 96,396 and (iv) Rs. 96,396.
4. M/s. Chiranji Lal Om Parkash, Faridabad—(i) Rs. 1,850, (iii) Rs. 31,231 and (iv) Rs. 33,081.
5. M/s. Kailash General Store, Bhiwani—(ii) Rs. 48,800 and (iv) Rs. 48,800.
6. Shri Beas Dev Dogra, Prop. M/s Dogra Steel, Faridabad—(ii) Rs. 5,84,648 and (iv) Rs. 5,84,648.
7. M/s. The Household & General Mills, Sonapat—(iii) 1,11,091 and (iv) Rs. 1,11,091.
8. M/s. The Duke Brothers (P) Ltd., Ambala Cantt—(iii) Rs. 28,229 and (iv) Rs. 28,229.
9. M/s. Rohtak District Transport Society, Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 26,968 and (iv) Rs. 26,968.
10. M/s. New Rohtak Bhiwani Transport Co; Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 90,519 and (iv) Rs. 90,519.
11. Bhagat Jaswant Singh, Ambala City—(iii) Rs. 35,281 and (iv) Rs. 35,281.
12. M/s. The Kuldip Oil Industries, (P) Ltd., Ambala Cantt—(iii) Rs. 28,930 and (iv) Rs. 28,930.
13. M/s. Metersain Jain & Sons, Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 31,893 and (iv) Rs. 31,893.
14. M/s. Banwari Lal Balwant Rai, Sirsa—(iii) Rs. 97,738 and (iv) Rs. 97,738.
15. M/s. Sat Narain, Hari Kumar, Nalwa, Distt. Bhiwani—(iii) Rs. 47,242 and (iv) Rs. 47,242.
16. Shri L. R. Twetia, c/o M/s. Fine Wires (P) Ltd., Palwal—(iii) Rs. 35,406 and (iv) Rs. 35,406.
17. Shri Kidar Nath, s/o Shri Durga Mal, Village Goad, Tehsil Narnaul—(iii) Rs. 73,298 and (iv) Rs. 73,298.
18. M/s. Har Prashad Tulsi Ram, Pehlad Dutt Nanak Chand, Village Gangaichajai, District Rewari—(iii) Rs. 1,04,731 and (iv) Rs. 1,04,731.
19. M/s. Suraj Bhan Duli Chand, Julana—(iii) Rs. 42,805 and (iv) Rs. 42,805.
20. M/s. General Mines Quarries and Co., Chandi Mandu, Distt. Ambala—(iii) Rs. 51,817 and (iv) Rs. 51,817.
21. Shri Inderjit Singh Sahney, 268 M.T., Sonapat—(iii) Rs. 60,841 and (iv) Rs. 60,841.
22. M/s. Sharmik Metal Production Cooperative Society, Jagadhri—(ii) Rs. 13,887, (iii) Rs. 70,910 and (iv) Rs. 84,797.

[F. No. HQ II/Pub/ Tax defaulters/76-77/6]

#### (अपय-कर)

का० आ० 2700.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है कि वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान यहाँ इसके पश्चात् त्रिमासिक ऐसे सभी करदाताओं के,

- (i) जो फर्म, कम्पनिया, अथवा अन्य व्यक्ति-संगम है, जिनकी आय एक लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा

- (ii) जो फर्म, कम्पनिया, अथवा अन्य व्यक्ति-संगम है, जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, नाम तथा उनसे सम्बन्धित अन्य विनिर्दिष्टा प्रकाशित की जाए,

और यत्. आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 13) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 4 जुलाई, 1974 के द्वारा सभी आयकर आयुक्तों को, वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर स्थित करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित नाम, पते, हैसियत तथा कर निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करदाताओं द्वारा विवरणित आय, निर्धारित आय, देय कर तथा दिए गए कर को प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक 5 जुलाई, 1974 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इससे सलग्न अनुसूची में उक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विनिर्दिष्टा पदों द्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

#### आयकर विभाग, पटियाला

ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों तथा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम जिनकी आय वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान एक लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है तथा सभी फर्मों, व्यक्ति संगम तथा कम्पनियों के नाम जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है।

- (i) हैसियत के लिए है—'आई' 'आय' के लिए, 'सी' कम्पनी के लिए
- (ii) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए,
- (iii) दी गई आय विवरणों के लिए,
- (iv) निर्धारित आय के लिए,
- (v) दिए जाने वाले कर के लिए,
- (vi) दिए गए कर के लिए है।

- 1 श्री बिमल नाथ, पानीपत (i) 'आई' (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 1,12,427 रु० (iv) 1,16,040 रु० (v) 76,731 रु० तथा (vi) 76,731 रु०।
- 2 श्री दीपक राज नाथ, मार्फत मैसर्स राज बल्लभ मिश्र, पानीपत—(i) 'आई' (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 1,81,090 रु० (iv) 1,87,930 रु० (v) 1,40,696 रु० तथा (vi) 1,34,100 रु०।
- 3 श्री जी० जी० पुरी, मार्फत मैसर्स गरम्बली इन्डस्ट्रियल मिल्कीट, यमुनानगर—(i) 'आई' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,56,150 रु० (iv) 1,78,030, (v) 1,09,525 रु० तथा (vi) 1,09,525 रु०।
- 4 श्रीमती भगवती देवी, गनेरीवाला—(i) 'आई' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,59,680 रु० (iv) 1,84,490 रु० (v) 1,06,857 रु० तथा (vi) 1,06,857 रु०।
- 5 श्री नन्द लाल गनरोवाला, मिरमा—(i) 'आई'—(ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,03,630 रु० (iv) 1,10,221 रु० (v) 63,386 रु० तथा (vi) 63,386 रु०।
6. मैसर्स यमुना मिल्कीट लि०, यमुनानगर—(i) 'सी' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 18,85,740 रु० (iv) 18,98,280 रु० (v) 10,90,482 रु० तथा (vi) 10,90,482 रु०।
- 7 मैसर्स अग्रवाल मेटल थर्म्स, (प्रा०) लि०, रिवाड़ी—(i) 'सी' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 8,82,750 रु० (iv) 10,39,665 रु० (v) 6,11,696 रु० तथा (vi) 6,21,340 रु०।

[का० स० संख्या० II प्रका०/आ० फ०/76-77/7]

## INCOME-TAX

**S.O. 2700.**—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assessee:

- (i) being individual, or Hindu undivided families, who have been assessed on an income of more than one lakh of rupees, and
- (ii) being firms, companies, or other association of persons, who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees,

during the financial year 1975-76.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Govt. has by its order dated 5th July, 1975, authorised all Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year, relating to assesses within their jurisdiction and the income returned by, the income assessed on, the tax payable by, and the tax paid by, such assesses during the financial year 1975-76;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 5th July, 1974, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assesses aforesaid

## Income Tax Department, Patiala

Names of all individuals and Hindu Undivided families assessed on an income of more than Rs. one lakh and of all firms, Association of persons and companies assessed on an income of more than Rs. ten lakhs during the financial year 1975-76: (i) is for Status—'I' for individual, 'C' for company; (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for income returned; (iv) for income assessed; (v) for tax payable and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Shri Vimal Nath, Panipat (i) 'I', (ii) 1974-75, (iii) Rs. 1,12,417, (iv) Rs. 1,16,040, (v) Rs. 76,731 and (vi) Rs. 76,731.
2. Shri Deepak Raj Nath c/o M/s. Raj Woollen Mills, Panipat—(i) 'I', (ii) 1974-75, (iii) Rs. 1,81,090, (iv) Rs. 1,87,930, (v) Rs. 1,40,696 and (vi) Rs. 1,34,400.
3. Shri D. D. Puri, c/o M/s. Saraswati Industrial Syndicate, Yamunanagar—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,56,150, (iv) Rs. 1,78,030, (v) Rs. 1,09,525 and (vi) Rs. 1,09,525.
4. Smt. Bhagwati Devi, Ganeriwala—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,59,680, (iv) Rs. 1,84,490, (v) Rs. 1,06,857 and (vi) Rs. 1,06,857.
5. Shri Nand Lal Ganerisala, Sirsa—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,03,630, (iv) Rs. 1,10,221, (v) Rs. 63,386 and (vi) Rs. 63,386.
6. M/s. Yamuna Syndicate Ltd., Yamunanagar—(i) 'C', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 18,85,740, (iv) Rs. 18,88,280, (v) Rs. 10,90,482 and (vi) Rs. 10,90,482.
7. M/s. Aggarwal Metal Works, (P) Ltd., Rewari—(i) 'C', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 8,82,750, (iv) Rs. 10,39,665, (v) Rs. 6,44,696 and (vi) Rs. 6,21,340.

[F. No. HQ II/Pub/I. Tax/76-77/7]

(धनकर)

क्र.० प्र.० 2701.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक तथा समर्थनीय है कि धनकर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) के अधीन यहाँ इस के पश्चात् विनिर्दिष्ट ऐसे करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित की जाएँ, जिनका शुद्ध धन वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित किया गया है।

और यत्. धनकर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) की धारा 42-क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1975 के द्वारा धनकर के सभी आयुक्तों को अपने क्षेत्राधिकार में स्थित करदाताओं से संबंधित नाम, पते, हैसियत तथा निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करदाताओं द्वारा बिबरणित धन, निर्धारित किए गए धन, तथा वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान देय धनकर तथा दिए गए धनकर का प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार के उपर्युक्त दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1975 के आदेश के अनुसार प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एतद्वारा इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में अपर्युक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

## आयकर विभाग

धन कर के ऐसे सभी करदाताओं के नाम, जिनका शुद्ध धन वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित किया गया था। (i) हैसियत के लिए है—'एच' (H) हिन्दु अविभक्त कुटुम्ब के लिए, (ii) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए (iii) दी गई शुद्ध धन विवरणी (रिटर्न) के लिए, (iv) निर्धारित शुद्ध धन के लिए (v) देय कर के लिए (vi) दिए गए कर के लिए है।

- 1 श्री पी० के० चौधरी, मालिक मिस्रों लक्ष्मी काटन ज़मिंग तथा आयल मिल्स, हिसार (i) 'एच' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 10,78,310 रु० (iv) 10,83,300 रु० (v) 41,914 रु० (vi) 41,914 रु०

[फा० सं० मुद्रा० II/प्रका०/धनकर/76-77/5]

वी० पी० गुप्ता, धनकर आयुक्त

## Wealth-tax

**S.O. 2701.**—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assesses who have been assessed under the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year 1975-76.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 42A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf the Central Government has by its Order dated 7th January, 1975 authorised all Commissioners of Wealth-tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year relating to assesses within their jurisdiction and wealth returned by, the wealth assessed on, the wealth-tax payable by and the wealth-tax paid by such assesses during the financial year 1975-76.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 7th January 1975, I hereby publish in Schedule, hereto annexed,

the names and other particulars of the assesses aforesaid.

## Income-tax Department

Names of all Wealth-tax assesses assessed on net Wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year 1975-76 (i) stands for status—'H' for H.U.F., (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for net wealth returned; (iv) for net wealth assessed (v) for tax payable and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Shri P K Choudhary, Prop. M/s Laxmi Cotton Ginning & Oil Mills, Hissar (i) 'H' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 10,78,310 (iv) Rs. 10,83,300 (v) Rs. 41,914 (vi) Rs. 41,914.

[F. No. HQ, II/Pub/W Tax/76-77/5]

V. P. GUPTA, Commissioner of Wealth tax

## उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(भारी उद्योग विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2702.—विकास परिषद् (प्रक्रिया सञ्चाली) नियम 1952 के नियम 2, 4 और 5 के साथ पठित, उद्योग (विकास और विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार पोत निर्माण, पोत भरण और पोत के आनुषंगिक पुर्जों के उत्पादन में लगे हुए, अनुसूचित उद्योगों के लिए एक विकास परिषद् गठित करती है।

2. उक्त विकास परिषद् में निम्नलिखित सदस्य होंगे जिनकी नियुक्ति की अवधि इस आदेश की तारीख से 2 वर्ष के लिए होगी —

पोत निर्माण, पोत भरण और पोत के आनुषंगिक पुर्जों के उत्पादन में लगे हुए अनुसूचित उद्योगों के लिए विकास परिषद्

## अध्यक्ष

1. श्री एच० पी० नन्दा,  
एसकाट्स लिमिटेड,  
11, मिथिया हाउस  
नई दिल्ली।

## सदस्य

2. श्री एम० एम० घोष  
संयुक्त सचिव,  
भारी उद्योग विभाग,  
नई दिल्ली
3. श्री एम० के० भट्टाचार्य,  
संयुक्त सचिव,  
रक्षा उत्पादन विभाग  
रक्षा मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली
4. श्री एम० पी० बालसुब्रह्मण्यम्  
संयुक्त सचिव, (मात्स्यिकी)  
कृषि विभाग,  
कृषि और विघाटी मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली
5. श्री एम० एम० गिल,  
संयुक्त सचिव, (पोत प्राण)  
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,  
नई दिल्ली
6. ब्रिगेडियर श्री० पी० नन्दा,  
विभाग सलाहकार (पत्तन)  
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय  
नई दिल्ली
7. भारत सरकार का समुद्री सलाहकार  
नौवहन महानिदेशालय,  
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,  
मुम्बई
8. भारत सरकार का मुख्य सल्लाहकार,  
नौवहन महानिदेशालय,  
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,  
मुम्बई

9. नौसेना डिजाइन निदेशक,  
नौसेना मुख्यालय,  
नई दिल्ली
10. रियर एडमिरल के० आर० आई० रामनाथ,  
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,  
हिन्दुस्तान शिपयार्ड लिमिटेड,  
विशाखापत्तनम्
11. आइस एडमिरल एन० कृष्णन्,  
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,  
कोचीन शिप यार्ड लिमिटेड,  
कोचीन
12. रियर एडमिरल कृष्ण देव,  
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,  
गार्डेन रीच, वर्क शॉप, लिमिटेड  
कलकत्ता
13. रियर एडमिरल ई० सी० गुरुबिला  
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,  
समगांध डाक लिमिटेड,  
मुम्बई
14. कमांडर के० जेलिया,  
अध्यक्ष, केन्द्रीय अन्तर्देशीय जलपरिवहन निगम,  
कलकत्ता
15. कैप्टन एम० प्रभाल,  
उप महा प्रबन्धक,  
भारत इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स लिमिटेड,  
बंगलूर
16. श्री जे० आर० त्रिभेदी,  
महा प्रबन्धक,  
गिप्रिया वर्क शॉप लिमिटेड,  
मुम्बई
17. श्री ऊनी कृष्णन्,  
भारमाधक निदेशक,  
बिभी इजीनियरिंग वर्क लिमिटेड,  
मद्रास
18. ब्रिगेडियर एम० पी० भट्टाचार्य,  
महाप्रबन्धक, सल्लोवा एफए,  
हवाली ट्राकिंग एण्ड इजीनियरिंग, कम्पनी, 12 मिशन रोड,  
कलकत्ता
19. एडमिरल एम० एम० नन्दा,  
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,  
शिपिंग कॉर्पोरेशन प्राइवेट लिमिटेड  
मुम्बई
20. श्री डी० एच० सी० स्टोने,  
ग्रेट ईस्टर्न शिपिंग कम्पनी लिमिटेड,  
मकंटाइल थैक ब्रिडज,  
60 एन० जी० रोड,  
मुम्बई
21. श्री आर० जी० साठे,  
इजीनियर अधीक्षक,  
दा विधिया 2 लिमिटेड रीजेन कम्पनी,  
मुम्बई

22. श्री एस० एस० मराठे,  
महिव इजीनियरिंग, कार्पोरेशन,  
मराठे उद्योग भवन,  
मुम्बई
23. श्री जे० सी० नागेया,  
निदेशक, गीता इजीनियरी वर्क्स प्रा० लि०,  
मुम्बई
24. श्री एस० के० मिन्हा,  
प्रबन्धक, टाका मशीनरी खण्ड,  
गार्डन रोड वर्कशॉप, लिमिटेड,  
कलकत्ता
25. श्री एस० एस० दोसीवाना,  
प्रध्यक्ष,  
पोत निर्माण, मरम्मत और अनुसंधान खण्ड  
इंडियन इजीनियरिंग एसोसिएशन,  
नई दिल्ली
26. मुख्य कार्यपालक,  
सेंट्रल मैरिन डिजाइन एण्ड रिसर्च आरगेनाइजेशन,  
(जब गठित किया जाए)
27. औद्योगिक सलाहकार (एच एस० ई०),  
तकनीकी विकास महानिदेशालय,  
नई दिल्ली
28. श्री गौर गोस्वामी,  
सदस्य, ए० आई० टी० यू० सी० की साधारण परिषद्  
जे०/179-ए, पन्नापुर रोड,  
कलकत्ता
29. श्री ब्यामाप्रसाद चौधरी,  
महामन्त्रि, जी० आर० डब्ल्यू वर्क्स एण्ड एम्प्लॉईज यूनियन,  
पो०-132, मुडिगली रोड, गार्डन रोड,  
कलकत्ता-24
30. श्री सतीश चन्द्र,  
विकास अधिकारी,  
तकनीकी विकास महानिदेशालय,  
उद्योग भवन,  
नई दिल्ली

2. विकास परिषद् के कृत्य वहां होंगे जो औद्योगिक (विकास और नियंत्रण) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की द्वितीय अनुसूची में वर्णित है।

3. श्री सतीश चन्द्र, विकास अधिकारी, तकनीकी विकास महानिदेशालय, को उक्त विकास परिषद् के सचिव के कृत्य करने के लिए नियुक्त किया गया है।

[का० सं० 16-13/76-एच एस 2]

एस० एस० घोष, सयुक्त सचिव

## MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Heavy Industry)

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1976

**S.O. 2702.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act,

1951 (65 of 1951), read with rules 2, 4 and 5 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby establishes a Development Council for the Scheduled Industries Engaged in Ship building, Ship Repairs, and Production of Ship Ancillaries.

2. The said Development Council shall consist of the following members whose tenure of appointment will be for a period of 2 years with effect from the date of this Order :—

Development Council for Scheduled Industries Engaged in Ship building, Ship Repairs and Production of Ship Ancillaries.

1. Chairman,  
Shri H. P. Nanda,  
Escorts Limited,  
11, Scindia House, New Delhi.

#### Members

2. Shri S. M. Ghosh,  
Joint Secretary,  
Department of Heavy Industry,  
New Delhi.
3. Shri S. K. Bhatnagar, Joint Secretary,  
Department of Defence Production,  
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
4. Shri S. P. Balasubramaniam,  
Joint Secretary (Fisheries),  
Department of Agriculture,  
Ministry of Irrigation and Agriculture,  
New Delhi.
5. Shri S. S. Gill,  
Joint Secretary (Shipyards),  
Ministry of Shipping and Transport,  
New Delhi.
6. Brig. O. P. Narula,  
Development Adviser (Ports),  
Ministry of Shipping and Transport, New Delhi.
7. Nautical Adviser to the Government of India,  
Directorate General of Shipping,  
Ministry of Shipping and Transport,  
Bombay.
8. Chief Surveyor to the Government of India,  
Directorate General of Shipping,  
(Ministry of Shipping and Transport),  
Bombay.
9. Director of Naval Designs,  
Naval Headquarters, New Delhi.
10. Rear Admiral K. R. J. Ramnath,  
Chairman and Managing Director,  
Hindustan Shipyard Limited,  
Visakhapatnam.
11. Vice Admiral N. Krishnan,  
Chairman and Managing Director,  
Cochin Shipyard Limited,  
Cochin.
12. Rear Admiral Krishan Dev,  
Chairman and Managing Director,  
Garden Reach Workshops Ltd.,  
Calcutta.
13. Rear Admiral E. C. Kuruvilla,  
Chairman and Managing Director,  
Mazagaon Dock Ltd. Bombay.
14. Commander K. Chelliah,  
Chairman, Central Inland Water Transport Corpn.,  
Calcutta.
15. Capt. S. Prabhala, Dy. General Manager,  
Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore.
16. Shri J. R. Trivedi, General Manager,  
Scindia Workshops Limited, Bombay

17. Shri Unnikrishnan, Director-in-Charge,  
Binny's Engineering Works Limited, Madras
18. Brig. S. P. Bhattacharya,  
General Manager Salkia Unit,  
Hooghly Docking and Engg. Co., 12-Mission Row,  
Calcutta.
19. Admiral S. M. Nanda, Chairman and Managing  
Director,  
Shipping Corporation of India Ltd.,  
Bombay.
20. Shri D. H. C. Storey,  
Great Eastern Shipping Co Ltd.,  
Mercantile Bank Building,  
60, N. G. Road, Bombay.
21. Shri R. G. Sathaye,  
Engineer Superintendent,  
The Scindia Steam Navigation Co.,  
Bombay.
22. Shri S. S. Marathe,  
Sachin Engineering Corporation;  
Marathe Udyog Bhavan, Bombay.
23. Shri J. C. Nangia, Director,  
Geeta Engineering Works Pvt. Ltd.,  
Bombay.
24. Shri S. K. Sinha,  
Manager, Dock Machinery Div.,  
Garden Reach Workshop Ltd.,  
Calcutta.
25. Shri S. S. Dotiwala, Chairman,  
Shipbuilding, Repairing and Ancillary Div.,  
Indian Engineering Association, N. Delhi.
26. Chief Executive,  
Central Marine Design and Research Organisation,  
(when set up).
27. Industrial Adviser (HME),  
Directorate General of Technical Development,  
New Delhi.
28. Shri Gour Goswami,  
Member, General Council of AITUC,  
J/179-A, Paharpur Road, Calcutta.
29. Shri Shyama Prosad Chowdhury,  
General Secretary, GRW Workers & Employees  
Union,  
P-132, Mudially Road, Garden Reach,  
Calcutta-24.
30. Shri Satish Chandra, Development Officer,  
Directorate General of Technical Development,  
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi.

2. The functions of the Development Council shall be those as enumerated in the Second Schedule to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951).

3. Shri Satish Chandra, Development Officer, Directorate General of Technical Development, is hereby appointed to carry on the functions of the Secretary of the said Development Council.

[F. No. 16-13/75-H.M.II]

S. M. GHOSH, Joint Secy.

### स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2703.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के खड (इ)

का अनुसरण करते हुए एयर मार्शल अजीत नाथ, जो 23 अप्रैल, 1976 (अपराह्न) को सेवा निवृत्त हो गए, के स्थान पर सशस्त्र सेना चिकित्सा सेवा के महानिदेशक लेफ्टिनेन्ट जनरल आर एम हूण को 21 अप्रैल, 1976 से भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् का सदस्य मनोनीत किया है।

अन्य अथवा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा भारत सरकार. स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय की 9 जनवरी, 1960 की अधिसूचना संख्या 5-13/58-एम० 1 में आगे और निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के खड (इ) के अधीन मनोनीत शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत क्रम संख्या 2 और उमगे संश्लित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टि रख ले ; अर्थात् :—

"2. लेफ्टिनेन्ट जनरल आर० एम० हूण, पी० डी० एम० एम०, ए० डी० एम० एम०, एफ० ए० एम० एम०, पी० ए० ए० एम०, महानिदेशक, सशस्त्र सेना चिकित्सा सेवा।"

[सं० डी० 11013/2/76-एम पी टी]

### MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2703.—Whereas the Central Government have, in pursuance of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the India Medical Council Act, 1956, nominated Lt. General R. S. Hoon, Director General, Armed Forces Medical Services, to be a member of the Medical Council of India, with effect from the 24th April, 1976 vice Air Marshal Ajit Nath, who retired on the 23rd April, 1976 (after noon);

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Planning No. 5-13/58-MI, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "Nominated under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 3", for serial No. 2 and the entry relating thereto, the following serial No. and entry shall be substituted, namely :—

"2. Lt. Gen. R. S. Hoon, PVSM, AVSM, FAMS, PHS, Director General, Armed Forces Medical Services".

[V. 11013/2/76-MPT]

का० प्रा० 2704.—सरकारी स्थान (अनाधिकृत अधिकारियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई मारणी के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी होने के नाते, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और आगे निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त मारणी के कालम 2 में निर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थान के अधिकार क्षेत्र की सीमाओं में उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा अथवा अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और सम्पदा अधिकारी को सीगे गए कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

### सारणी

अधिकारियों का पदनाम	सरकारी स्थानों की श्रेणियाँ और अधिकार क्षेत्र की स्थानीय सीमाएँ
अधीक्षक, लेडी रीडिंग स्वास्थ्य स्कूल, दिल्ली 110006	लेडी रीडिंग हेल्थ स्कूल, दिल्ली के अधिकार क्षेत्र में सभी सरकारी आवास।

[सं० डी० 11029/3/76-एन (एमपीटी)]

एस० श्रीनिवासन, उप सचिव

**S.O. 2704.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the estate officer by or under the said Act within the limits of her jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

1	2
The Superintendent, Lady Reading Health School, Delhi-110006.	All Government accommodation in the Jurisdiction of Lady Reading Health School, Delhi.

[No. D. 11029/3/76-N(MPT)]

S. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

**का० प्रा० 2705.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली, 1975 के नियम 1 के उपनियम (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एवम्द्वारा मद्रास के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्र को अपने और विनिश्चित करती है जिसमें उक्त नियमावली लागू होगी, अर्थात् :—

मयलापुर डिस्पेंसरी (सं० 6)

उत्तर में थाउजैण्ड लाइट्स मार्क की ओर माउन्ट रोड और पीटर्स रोड के जंक्शन से चल कर पूर्व की ओर पीटर्स रोड बसंत रोड के साथ-साथ वहाँ तक आगे बढ़िएँ जहाँ समुद्र तट तक का क्षेत्र, फिर वहाँ से दक्षिण की ओर समुद्र तट के साथ-साथ बाला क्षेत्र जहाँ उसका संगम अड्यार नदी से होता है, फिर वहाँ से पश्चिम की ओर अड्यार नदी के साथ साथ वहाँ तक का क्षेत्र जहाँ उसका संगम बोट क्लब एवेन्यू पर माउजैज गार्डन II स्ट्रीट से होता है, फिर उत्तर की ओर माउजैज रोड पर, माउजैज गार्डन II स्ट्रीट के साथ-साथ का क्षेत्र जहाँ इसका एल्डम रोड से संगम होता है, फिर वहाँ से उत्तर की ओर माउन्ट रोड के साथ साथ वहाँ तक का क्षेत्र जहाँ से एस श्रीधरालय की सीमा शुरू होती है।

[संख्या एफ डी 12019/34/76-के० संस्था० यो० 2]

एन० एस० भाटिया, अवर सचिव

**S.O. 2705.**—In pursuance of sub-rule (3) of rule 1 of the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, the Central Government hereby specifies the following further area in Madras to which the said rules shall extend, namely :—

Mylapore Dispensary (No. 6).

On the north, starting from the junction of Mount Road and Peters Road at Thousand lights Mosques, proceed east along Peter's Road-Basant Road upto its junction with the sea coast, proceed south along the coast upto its junction with Adyar River, proceed west along with Adyar river upto its junction with Mowbrays Garden II street at Boat Club Avenue, proceed north along Mowbrays Garden II street. Mowbrays Road upto its junction with Eldam's Road, proceed west along Eldam's Road upto its junction with Mount Road, proceed north along Mount Road to reach the starting point.

[No. D. 12019/34/76-CGHS II]

N. S. BHATIA, Under Secy.

## कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(कृषि विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 3 जुलाई, 1976

**का० प्रा० 2706.**—“पूर्व विन्यास अधिनियम, 1890 के अधीन सर कुसरो वाडिया न्यास निधि की प्रतिभूतियों के पुनर्विनिधान के विषय में।”

पूर्व विन्यास अधिनियम 1890 (1890 का 6) की धारा 10 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार निवेश करती है कि भारत के पूर्व विन्यास का कोषपाल महाराष्ट्र सरकार के कृषि और सहकारी विभाग मुम्बई के सचिव को 97.08 रु० (केवल सत्तानवे रुपए आठ पैसे) की राशि वापिस करेगा जो कि 12,86,100 रु० के 1970-75 3 प्रतिशत के प्रथम विकास उधार के पुनर्विनिधान आगमों से अतिरिक्त पूंजी अन्वेष के रूप में है, जिसमें से 12,86,002.92 रु० सर कुसरो वाडिया न्यास निधि के मध्ये 12,81,300 रु० के 1976 के 4½ प्रतिशत महाराष्ट्र सरकार के उधार में पुनर्विनिहित किए गए हैं।

[सं० 22-21/75-जी० सी०]

सन्तोख सिंह, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976

**S.O. 2706.**—“In the matter of reinvestment of the securities of the Sir Cusrow Wadia Trust Fund under the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890”.

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government hereby directs that the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India shall refund to the Secretary, Government of Maharashtra, Agriculture and Cooperation Department, Bombay a sum of Rs. 97.08 (Rupees Ninetyseven and paise eight only) as being the un-invested capital balance, out of the reinvestment proceeds of 3% 1st Development Loan 1970-75 for Rs. 12,86,100 of which Rs. 12,86,002.92 have been reinvested in the 4½% Maharashtra Government loan 1976 for Rs. 12,81,300 on account of the Sir Cusrow Wadia Trust Fund.

[No. 22-21/75-Genl. Coord]

SANTOKH SINGH, Dy. Secy.

## सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 3 जुलाई, 1976

**का० प्रा० 2707.**—अपचित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उप नियम (1) के साथ पठित नियम 8 और अलपित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5(1) के द्वारा प्रवृत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एवम्द्वारा श्रीमति एन० एस० मणि को तत्काल से अपने आदेश तक, फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के मद्रास गलाहकार वेनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 11/4/74-एफ०सी०]

एस० घोष, उप सचिव



**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING**

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976

**S.O. 2707.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) and Rule 8 read with sub-rule (1) of Rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Smt. N. S. Mani as a member of the Advisory Panel of the Board of Film Censors at Madras with immediate effect until further orders.

[No. 11/4/74-FC]

S. GHOSE, Dy. Secy

**संचार मंत्रालय**

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

**का० प्रा० 2708**—नागपत्तिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिये जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है नागपत्तिनम में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 22 मई 1975 को "इंडियन एक्सप्रेस" मसुराई समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

हमलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से नागपत्तिनम का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा—

नागपत्तिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—नागपत्तिनम का स्थानीय क्षेत्र यही होगा जोकि नागपत्तिनम नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार में पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो की नागपत्तिनम नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हें नागपत्तिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से अवगतगी करेंगे।

[स 3-13/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS**

(P &amp; T Board)

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

**S.O. 2708.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Nagapattinam, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 22nd May 1975 in newspaper 'Indian Express' Madurai;

50 GI/76—3

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Nagapattinam shall be as under;

**Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System**

The local area of Nagapattinam shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Nagapattinam Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Nagapattinam Municipal limit but who are served from Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

**का० प्रा० 2709.**—तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिये जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है तेनकासी में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 16 व 18 नवम्बर, 1975 को 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

हमलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से तेनकासी का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—तेनकासी का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि तेनकासी नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार में पड़ता है,

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि तेनकासी नगरपालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हें तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से अवगतगी करेंगे।

[स० 3-13/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2709.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Tenkasi, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 16th and 18th November 1975 in newspaper 'Dinamalar';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Tenkasi shall be as under;

**Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System**

The local area of Tenkasi shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Tenkasi Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Tenkasi Municipal limit but who are served from Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

**का० आ० 2710.**—शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिये जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है शैनकोटाह में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 16 व 18 नवम्बर 1975 को 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434(III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से शैनकोटाह का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

**शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था**—शैनकोटाह का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि शैनकोटाह नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि शैनकोटाह नगरपालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु उन्हें शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे जब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से अदायगी करेंगे।

[सं० 3-13/74 पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2710.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Shencottah Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Shencottah, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 16th and 18th November 1975 in newspaper 'Dinamalar';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Shencottah shall be as under;

**Shencottah Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Shencottah shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Shencottah Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Shencottah Municipal limit but who are served from Shencottah Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

**का० आ० 1711.**—शंकर नगर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है शंकर नगर में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उन से कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उन के कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 19 नवम्बर, 1975 को 'मलाइ मुरासु' व 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से शंकर नगर का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

**शंकर नगर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था**—शंकर नगर का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि शंकर नगर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अग्रिय दूरी के अन्तर्गत पड़ता है।

किन्तु यह सीमा दक्षिण में तम्ब्रापारुनी नदी तक और तिरुनलवेली टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अग्रिय दूरी की रेखा तक होगा।

[सं० 3-13/74-पी०एच०बी०]

**S.O. 2711.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Sankarnagar, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 19th November 1975 in Newspapers 'Malai Murasu' and 'Dina Malar';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Sankarnagar shall be as under;

**Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Sankarnagar shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange;

Provided that in South this limit shall be restricted to Tambraparuni River and the line of 5 Kms radial distance from Tirunelveli.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

**का० आ० 2712.**—बारंगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434(III) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है बारंगल में चालू समाचार पत्रों में

निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 10 नवम्बर, 1975 को दैनिक समाचार पत्र 'दि डेक्कन क्रोनिक्ल' में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियाँ और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से वारंगल का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा—

वारंगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था वारंगल का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि वारंगल नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार में पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि वारंगल नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हें वारंगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से भ्रदायगी करेंगे।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी०एच०बी०]

**S.O. 2712.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Warangal Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Warangal, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 10th November 1975 in daily Newspaper "The Deccan Chronicle";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-1976 the revised local area of Warangal shall be as under;

**Warangal Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Warangal shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Warangal Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Warangal Municipal limit but who are served from Warangal Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

**का० प्रा० 2713.**—विजयवाड़ा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है विजयवाड़ा में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 1976 को 'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' व 13 जनवरी, 1976 की "आन्ध्र पत्रिका" समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियाँ और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से विजयवाड़ा का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा—

**विजयवाड़ा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था**—विजयवाड़ा का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि विजयवाड़ा नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार में पड़ता है,

किन्तु टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि विजयवाड़ा नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हें विजयवाड़ा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से भ्रदायगी करेंगे।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी०एच०बी०]

**S.O. 2713.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Vijaywada Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Vijaywada, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in Newspaper "Indian Express" and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Pradesh";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Vijaywada shall be as under;

**Vijaywada Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Vijaywada shall cover, an area falling under the jurisdiction of Vijaywada Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Vijaywada Municipal limit but who are served from Vijaywada Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-2-/74-PHB]

**का० प्रा० 2714.**—विजयवाड़ा औद्योगिक सम्पदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बी बी) में अपेक्षित है विजयवाड़ा औद्योगिक सम्पदा में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्र पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियाँ और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक डाक-तार ने घोषित

किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से विजयवाड़ा आ० सं० का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

**विजयवाड़ा औद्योगिक संपदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—**विजयवाड़ा औद्योगिक संपदा का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि विजयवाड़ा औद्योगिक संपदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा दक्षिण में कृष्णानदी तक, पूर्व में बंदुर रोड और कमुर रोड जंक्शन पर 5/5 किलोमीटर तक, केमुर रोड और डोंका रोड तक, उत्तर-पश्चिम में रिंग रोड तक, और पश्चिम में विजयवाड़ा नगर पालिका की सीमा तक होगी।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2714.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, in the Newspapers in circulation at Vijaywada Industrial Estate, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper 'Andhra Patrika';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate shall be as under ;

**Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from the Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Krishna River in South, to Km 5/5 on Bandur Road and Kanuru Road junction, Kanuru Road and Donka Road in East, to Ring Road in North-West, and boundary of Vijaywada Municipality in West.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

**का० आ० 2715.**—रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में अपेक्षित है रामवरपाद में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्र पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से रामवरपाद का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

**रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—**रामवरपाद का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जोकि रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा उत्तर में विजयवाड़ा-मुस्ताबाद रेलवे लाइन तक, पश्चिम में विजयवाड़ा नगर पालिका की सीमा तक, और दक्षिण में रिंग रोड, डोंका रोड और कनुरु कसरपल्ली रोड होगी।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2715.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Ramavarapaddu inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper 'Andhra Patrika';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Ramavarapaddu shall be as under;

**Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Ramavarapaddu shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms. radial distance from the Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange ;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Vijaywada Mustabad Railway line in the North, boundary of Vijaywada Municipality in the West and Ring Road, Denka Road and Kanuru Kesarapalli Road in the South.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

**का० आ० 2716.**—पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में अपेक्षित है पोरंकी में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्रपत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से पोरंकी का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

**पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—**पोरंकी का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा दक्षिण-पश्चिम में कृष्णानदी, दक्षिण पूर्व में कानुपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी की लाइन, उत्तर में कुरु कमरपल्ली रोड और उत्तर-पश्चिम में बांदुरगोड और कनुरु रोड जंक्शन पर 5/5 कि० मी० तक होगी।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2716.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Poranki Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, in the Newspapers in circulation at Paranki, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper "Indian Express" and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Poranki shall be as under:

**Poranki Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Poranki shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms. radial distance from Poranki Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Krishna River in the South-West, line of 5 Kms radial distance from Kankipaddu Telephone Exchange in the South-East, Kanuru Kesarapalli Road in North and Kms 5/5 on Bandar Road and Kanuru Road Junction in North-West.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

**का० ग्रा० 2717.**—मंगल गिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बढ़ती किये जाने के बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए, जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में अधोक्षित है मंगलगिरि में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्र पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से मंगलगिरि का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा।

**मंगल गिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था.**—मंगलगिरि का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जोकि मंगलगिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा पूर्व में तानाखी रोड पर 22 कि० मी० तक होगी।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

**S.O. 2717.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at

Mangalagiri, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper "Indian Express" and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Mangalagiri shall be as under:

**Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Mangalagiri shall cover an area falling within 15 Kms. radial distance from Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Kms 22 on Tenali Road in East.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

**का० ग्रा० 2718.**—मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बढ़ती किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में अधोक्षित है मुस्ताबाद में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्र पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से मुस्ताबाद का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा।

**मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था.**—मुस्ताबाद का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा पश्चिम में तुन्ना और रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन, दक्षिण में पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन, और पूर्व में गनाबरम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन तक होगी।

[सं० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

ग्रा० ना० कील, निदेशक फोन (ई)

**S.O. 2718.**—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Mustabad Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Mustabad, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper 'Andhra Patrika';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Mustabad shall be as under;

**Mustabad Telephone Exchange System.**—The local area of Mustabad shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from Mustabad Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to the line of 5 Kms radial distance from Nunna and Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchanges in the West, line of 5 Kms radial distance from Peranki Telephone Exchange in South and line of 5 Kms radial distance from Gannavaram Telephone Exchange in East.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

P. N. KAUL, Dir. of Telephones (E)

### भ्रम मंत्रालय

#### प्रदेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 मार्च, 1976

का० प्रा० 2719:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स बी० सी० सी० लिमिटेड की रामकनाली कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरासगढ़ जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं भ्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की रामकनाली कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरासगढ़ जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, 4/6/73 से श्री गोपालकृष्ण सहाय, मुंशी और संची कुमार जनरल मजदूर को काम न देने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल-20012/97/75-डी-3(ए)]

### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th March, 1976

**S.O. 2719.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Ram Kanali Colliery of M/s B.C.C.Ltd. P.O. Katrasgarh Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Ram Kanali Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Katrasgarh, Distt. Dhanbad is justified in not providing work to Shri Gopal Krishan Sahai, Munshi and Sachi Kumar General Mazdoor with effect from 4-6-73 ? If not to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled ?

[No. L-20012/97/75-D. III(A)]

#### प्रदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2720:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल माईन्स लि० की जोगिदिह कोलियरी, डाकघर टुन्दू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं भ्रम न्यायालय सं० 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की जोगिदिह कोलियरी, डाकघर टुन्दू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र का श्री तिलक महतो, अंडर ग्राउन्ड ट्रैमर को 19 जुलाई, 1974 से उनके काम से रोक देना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-20012/237/75 डी 3-(ए)]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

**S.O. 2720.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jogidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Mines Limited Post Office Tundoo District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Jogidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited Post Office Tundoo District Dhanbad are justified in stopping Shri Tilak Mahato Underground Trammer from his work with effect from 19th July, 1974? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/237/75-D. IIIA]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 11 मई, 1976

का० आ० 2721.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में क्षेत्र संख्या 6 कोल माईन्स अधीरिटी लिमिटेड, डाकघर मुगमा जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं अम न्यायालय संख्या 2 धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

## अनुसूची

क्या कोल माईन्स अधीरिटी लिमिटेड के क्षेत्रीय महाप्रबन्धक, क्षेत्र सं० 6, डाकघर मुगमा (जिला धनबाद) की निम्नलिखित कर्मकारों को प्रत्येक कर्मकार के सामने दर्शाए गए विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में, स्थानान्तरित करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है :—

1. श्री प्रवीण कुमार चन्द्र, बिजली मिस्त्री 5-2-1975 से लखीमाता कोलियरी से दुमका उप-क्षेत्र।
2. श्री राम गोरेई, ट्रैम्पर, 8-2-75 से मंडमान कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 4.
3. श्री सदानन्द सिंह, ड्रिलमैन, 8-2-1975 से मंडमान कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 5.
4. श्री बाल्मीकि महाराज, माइनिंग मिरदार, 5-2-1975 से शामपुर-1 कोलियरी से दुमका उप-क्षेत्र।
5. श्री हरिप्रसाद मल्लाह, इलेक्ट्रिक हैल्पर 8-2-75 से गोपीनाथपुर कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 3.
6. श्री रजोहरि बनर्जी, ओवरमैन, 8-2-1975 से गोपीनाथपुर कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 3
7. श्री हरध्यान भंडारी, जैनमैन, 8-2-1975 से बावजना कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 5
8. श्री अश्विनी बौरी, लाईन मिस्त्री, 8-2-1975 से लखीमाता कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 5.
9. श्री छेदी सिंह, बिजली मिस्त्री, 8-2-1975 से बावजना कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 5
10. श्री डी के गोस्वामी, बिल क्लर्क, 8-2-1975 से कापासारा कोलियरी से क्षेत्र संख्या 5

यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल-20012(85)/75-डी 3ए]

आर०पी० नरुला, अवर सचिव (विशेष)

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th May, 1976

S.O. 2721.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Area No. VI Coal Mines Authority Limited Post Office Mugma District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum-Labour Court No. 2 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Area General Manager Area No. VI of Coal Mines Authority Limited Post Office Mugma (District Dhanbad) in transferring the following workmen of different areas as indicated against each workman is justified :—

1. Shri Pradeep Kumar Chandra, Electrician, Lakhimata Colliery to Dumka Sub Area w.e.f. 5-2-75.
2. Shri Ram Gorai, Trammer, Mandman Colliery to Area No. IV with effect from 8-2-75.
3. Shri Sadanand Singh, Drillman, Mandman Colliery to Area No. V with effect from 8-2-75.
4. Shri Balmiki Maharaj, Mining Sirdar Shampur-I Colliery to Dumka Sub Area w.e.f. 5-2-75.
5. Shri Hari Prasad Mallah, Electric Helper Gopinathpur Colliery to Area No. III w.e.f. 8-2-75.
6. Shri Rakho Hari Bannerjee overman Gopinathpur Colliery to Area No. III w.e.f. 8-2-1975.
7. Shri Haradhan Bhandari Chainman Badjna Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
8. Shri Aswini Bouri, Line Mistry Lakhimata Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
9. Shri Chedi Singh Electrician Badjna Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
10. Shri D. K. Goswami Bill Clerk, Kapasara Colliery to Area No V w.e.f. 8-2-75.

If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-20012/65/75-D. IIIA]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

का०आ० 2722.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ,

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947(1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के प्रतीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 1), सम्बन्धित न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या मूनिन बैंक आफ इंडिया, अकोला शाखा के प्रबन्धतंत्र की श्री मोहन एम० अग्रवाल, निवृत्त की सेवाएं 16 जून, 1974 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-12012(179)/75-डी-2ए]

आर० कुजीथापदम, अवर सचिव

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

**S.O. 2722.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Union Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. (1) Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Union Bank of India, Akola Branch in terminating the services of Shri Mohan N. Agarwal Clerk with effect from the 16th June 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L. 12012/179/75/DII(A)]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

**S.O. 2723.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Delhi Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 1st July, 1976.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

**Reference No. 8 of 1974**

(Ministry's Order No. L-41012/10/74/LRII,  
Dated, 15-6-1974)

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Delhi Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited.

#### AND

Their Workmen.

#### PARTIES :

Mr. Justice K. B. Srivastava (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri J. N. P. Sinha, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Railway.

**Dhanbad, dated the 28th June, 1976**

#### AWARD

The introductory facts (leaving aside the details thereof which will appear in the discussions) lie within a narrow compass.

2. The Dehri Rohtas Light Railway (hereinafter called the Railway Company) is a "Railway Company", within the meaning of clause (o) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, (hereinafter called the Act), read with clause (5) of Section 3 of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (hereinafter called the Railways Act). The track of the Railway is very short, being 66.34 Kilometres. There are only 17 Railway Stations (including a flag station) : Dehri-On-Sone being the first and Tiura Pipradih the last on this track. Rohtas Station is the 10th and Nawhatta Road is the 15th Station. Shri A. Kumar, the Traffic Manager of the Railway Company, issued a declaration Ext. W-1 (Ext. M-7 being a copy of the same) on January 21/25, 1974 classifying the employment of all the Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters as "essentially intermittent" between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road Stations. By a similar declaration Ext. W-2 (Ext. M-8 being a copy of that) dated January 30, 1974 the Traffic Manager classified the employment of all Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters/Pointsmen as "essentially intermittent" in respect of all the 17 Stations. Thus Pointsmen who were formerly excluded from the first declaration Ext. W-1, were included in the second declaration Ext. W-2. The second change made by Ext. W-2 was that instead of the declaration applying only to Stations between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road, it was now applied to all the 17 Stations from Terminus to Terminus, that is to say, from Dehri-On-Sone to Tiura Pipradih. The effect of these two declarations was to enhance the working hours from 8 to 12. A copy of these two declarations was duly sent by the Traffic Manager to the Regional Labour Commissioner. The employees of the Railway Company felt dissatisfied with these two declarations and consequently Shri Radha Raman Prasad, WW-1, the General Secretary of the Delhi Rohtas Light Railway Mazdoor Sewa Sangh, an unrecognised Union (hereafter called the Union), sent an application Ext. M-31 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Patna on January 31, 1974 protesting that the Railway Company had effected a change in the conditions of service applicable to the employees in that the working hours had been enhanced from 8 to 12 and he (Assistant Labour Commissioner) should intervene and stop the Railway Company from changing the hours of work without compliance with Section 9A of the Act. The Assistant Labour Commissioner, Patna, transferred the application Ext. M-31 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Hazaribagh for necessary action on February 15, 1974. The latter wrote the letter Ext. M-32 on February 25, 1974 to the Secretary of the Railway Company forwarding therewith a copy of the application of the union to him and inviting him to participate in conciliation proceedings. In the meantime, the Railway Company had withdrawn its two declarations with effect from February 14, 1974 by a circular Ext. M-9. The Railway Company sent the letter Ext. M-10 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Hazaribagh on April 15, 1974 in reply to Ext. M-32 wherein the attitude taken up by the Railway Company was that (1) the union was not a recognised union and was thus not entitled to raise any industrial dispute, and (2) it (The Railway Company) had classified the employment from "continuous" to "essentially intermittent", in exercise of its statutory powers, as a purely temporary measure during a period of emergency and Section 9A of the Act had no application. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure, as no meeting ground could be found in the view points of the union and the Railway Company. Accordingly the Assistant Labour Commissioner sent a failure report Ext. M-11 to the Central Government on April 22, 1974 wherein he specified the dispute thus, namely, (1) competency or otherwise of the union to raise the industrial dispute, (2) the legal validity or otherwise of the two declarations without compliance with Section 9A of the Act, and (3) liability or otherwise for payment for overtime work beyond 8 hours.



3. The Central Government, in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Act, has relieved the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of Messrs Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited, Dalmia Nagar to change the working hours of Station Masters, Assistant Station Masters and pointsmen employed by them during the period from 25th January, 1974 to 13th February, 1974 was legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

4. In response to the notices issued to the parties, the workmen filed their written statement on July 5, 1974; and the Railway Company filed its written statement, as also its rejoinder to the written statement of the workmen, on July 17, 1974. The workmen filed their rejoinder to the written statement of the Railway Company, on July 24, 1974.

5. No issues were framed by my learned predecessor-in-office.

6. The parties have adduced both oral and documentary evidence. The Union has examined Radha Raman Prasad as WW-1 and Railway Company has produced D. K. Jain and Phulendra Prasad as MWs. 1 and 2. In addition, the Union has filed four documents Ext. W-1 to W-4 and the Railway Company has filed 32 documents Ext. M-1 to M-32.

7. Several questions of law and fact were canvassed before the Tribunal, and I propose to take them now, one by one.

8. The first contention raised by the Railway Company is that the union on the espousal of which the reference has been made, is an un-recognised union which does not possess a representative character to act on behalf of the body of workmen and as such the espousal made by it will not convert the dispute, if any, into an “Industrial Dispute”, within the meaning of Sec. 2(k) of the Act. The stand taken by the union in this regard is that no doubt it has been recognised by the Railway Company but nonetheless it is the only representative union of the workmen of the Railway Company, a fact which was verified by the Central Government itself who advised the Railway Company to grant recognition to it but due to malafides on the part of the Railway Company, recognition is not forthcoming but that fact of non-recognition will have no effect on its legal right to sponsor the cause so as to convert it into an industrial dispute.

9. Admittedly, there are two rival unions amongst the employees of the Railway Company, one called the Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Employees' Union (hereinafter called the recognised Union) which is a registered trade union and has been recognised by the Railway Company, and the second, the union before the Tribunal which is also a registered trade union but is un-recognised. There is a short history which will elucidate the position. It appears that the union, after its registration as a trade union, took up the matter of recognition with the Government of India, Department of Labour and Employment, sometime in the year 1971. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) called for certain information from the union and informed the Railway Company also about the pending proceeding with regard to the matter of recognition. This will be apparent from Annexure 3 to Ext. M-28. On a consideration of the information collected, the Deputy Director, Department of Labour and Employment, informed the union by letter Ext. W-3 dated February 3, 1972 that the union had been found to be eligible for recognition and the Railway Company has been requested to confer recognition on it. A letter (Annexure 5 of Ext. M-28) was despatched on the same date by the Deputy Director to the Railway Company also mentioning therein that the verification made by the Chief Labour Commissioner's Organisation revealed that the union represented the majority of the employees and was thus entitled to recognition under the Code of Discipline in place of the recognised union and since under the said Code, only the majority union can function as a recognised union, the Railway Company should confer recognition upon the union and withdraw it from the recognised union. The recognised union thereupon filed a writ petition in the Patna High Court (Ext. M-28) and obtained a stay order (Ext. M-22) on March 25,

1972 to the effect that the Government of India's direction to the Railway Company to withdraw recognition from the recognised union shall remain stayed during the pendency of the writ petition. The Railway Company apprised the Government of India about the situation created by the stay order by its letter Ext. M-29 dated April 5, 1972. The above position has remained un-disputed before me. It comes to this, therefore, that there are two rival unions; both are registered trade unions, one is recognised and the other un-recognised by the Railway Company. The matter of de-recognition of the recognised union is in a state of suspension on account of the prohibitory order issued by the High Court. However, there is no prohibition imposed on the recognition of the union. Be that as it may, I must take into reckoning the fact that on a verification made by an independent authority, the union was found to be more representative of the employees than the recognised union. Indeed, a direction was issued by the Government of India to withdraw recognition of the recognised union and to confer it upon the union. In the circumstance, therefore, it is not possible for me to hold that the union is not entitled to raise an industrial dispute on behalf of the employees of the Railway Company. It was argued by the learned counsel for the Railway Company that the union has not filed a copy of any resolution passed by its Executive Committee authorising Radha Raman Prasad, WW-1 to raise the dispute on behalf of the employees and, therefore, it should be held that Radha Raman Prasad has no authority on behalf of the union to raise the dispute. I regret I cannot accept this contention as well-founded either in fact or in law. If the Railway Company intended to challenge this position, it should have raised a specific plea either in its written statement, or at any rate, in its rejoinder but there is a conspicuous omission of this fact. On the other hand, the Railway Company itself elicited in the cross-examination of Radha Raman Prasad that a Resolution was passed by the Executive Committee of the union that the dispute should be raised regarding the question of classification. It is immaterial, therefore, in the circumstances, that a copy of the original Resolution has not been exhibited. There has to be a presumption that when the union takes action, it is as a representative of, and with the support of its members; and it is for the party contesting this fact to prove that the facts are otherwise and that the members of the union are not behind it in its action. See *Hindustan Times Limited Vs. Chief Commissioner, 1957 (11) LLJ, 466* and *Express News Papers (P) Limited Vs. First Labour Court 1959 (1) ILJ 600*. Again, the contention that an un-recognised union cannot take up the cause in the process of collective bargaining on behalf of its members, has only to be stated to be rejected. It was held by their Lordships of the Supreme Court in *State of Bihar Vs. Kripa Shankar Jaiswal 1961 (1) LLJ, 334* that it would be an erroneous view if it were said that for a dispute to constitute an industrial dispute it is a requisite condition that it should be sponsored by a recognised union or that all the workmen of an industrial establishment should be parties to it. I have, therefore, no hesitation in rejecting this contention.

10. The next contention of the learned counsel for the Railway Company is that the dispute, if any, in question, is not an industrial dispute, capable of reference under Section 10(1)(d) and as such this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to deal with the matter. The contention is based on two propositions, namely, (1) that until a demand was made by the union on the Railway Company directly, there cannot be an industrial dispute capable of reference, and (2) if a schedule of hours of employment, is the direct result of classification of employment under a statute or rules framed thereunder, then, the Fourth Schedule, or Section 9A of the Act, or for that matter, the Act itself can have no application so that even if there is a dispute between the union and the Railway Company in the ordinary sense of the term, it cannot become an industrial dispute under Sec. 2(K) for the simple reason that the Act has no application. I propose to deal with these two propositions separately from each other.

11. The reliance for the first proposition is placed on *Sindhu Re-Settlement Corporation Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, AIR 1968 SC, 529* and *Fedders, Lloyd Corporation (Pvt) Limited Vs. Lt. Governor, AIR 1970 Delhi 60*. In the Supreme Court Case, *Ambwaney*, after collecting retrenchment compensation from the subsidiary concern on his retrenchment, went to the principal concern and made request for a posting order which was refused and then demanded retrenchment compensation, which was also refused. His case was taken up by his union and both *Ambwaney* and the union

wrote separately to the principal demanding retrenchment compensation and not re-instatement. Thereafter there were some conciliation proceedings and on the report of the Conciliation Officer, the Government referred the demand for re-instatement for adjudication to the Tribunal. The point raised was that the dispute that Ambwaney and the union had raised before the principal concern was confined to compensation for retrenchment and did not relate to the validity of the retrenchment or re-instatement and consequently the Government had no jurisdiction to refer the dispute relating to the question or reinstatement to the Tribunal. On these facts, the Supreme Court held that since both Ambwaney and union demanded payment of retrenchment compensation only by the principal concern and did not raise an dispute for re-instatement, the Government was competent to refer the question of retrenchment compensation only to the tribunal and not the question of re-instatement. It further observed that no doubt the order of reference mentions that the Government had considered the report submitted by the conciliation officer under Section 12(4) of the Act in respect of the dispute between the parties over the demand mentioned in the schedule and, in the schedule, the Government mentioned that the dispute was that of re-instatement; and it may be that the Conciliation Officer reported to the Government that an industrial dispute did exist relating to re-instatement, but the evidence produced before the Tribunal clearly showed that no such dispute had ever been raised by Ambwaney or by his union with the principal concern, and if no dispute at all was raised by the two with the principal concern, any request sent by them to the Government would only be a demand by them and not an industrial dispute between them and the principal concern. A mere demand to the Government, without a dispute being raised by the workmen with the employer, cannot become an industrial dispute. It was further observed that the two had confined their demands to the principal concern to retrenchment compensation only and did not make any demand for reinstatement and, therefore the reference made by the Government was not competent. In the Delhi High Court case, Ajab Singh either resigned his job or was retrenched by the company. Thereafter he did not make any demand on the company directly. He, however, wrote to the Labour Commissioner stating that his services had been terminated by way of retrenchment which was wrongful and arbitrary and he was entitled to re-instatement. The claim of Ajab Singh was sent by the conciliation officer to the company for comments, but no comments were received in writing. The matter was, however, orally discussed and the company conveyed to the conciliation officer its defence on merits and resisted the claim of Ajab Singh on the ground that there was no industrial dispute which could be referred to adjudication. As there was no possibility of settlement, the conciliation proceedings were closed and a failure report was made by the conciliation officer to the Government. On a consideration of the report under Section 12(5), the Government referred the dispute to the Labour Court for adjudication. The company thereupon filed a writ petition in the High Court. Dua C. J. and Deshpande J. made certain preliminary observations, namely, that a dispute or difference in Section 2(k) means that one party asserts something, which is denied by the other or that the demand of one party is refused by the other; that Section 12, read with Section 10, does not contemplate that an industrial dispute can arise for the first time during the proceedings before the conciliation officer; that Section 10(2), read with Rule 3(c) of the Rules presupposes efforts made by the parties themselves to adjust the dispute before an approach can be made to Government for reference to adjudication. Their Lordships then proceeded to interpret the Supreme Court decision (Supra) to ascertain its proper scope and implication and observed thus;

"The Supreme Court has also clarified that even if the conciliation officer found that an industrial dispute existed and so reported to the Government, this could not be regarded as the existence of the industrial dispute which has to be founded upon a demand by the workmen on the employers. If this is the ratio of the Supreme Court decision it cannot be said that an industrial dispute existed... as no demand was made... on the company before he made an application under Sec. 10(2) for reference. In that event the fact that the demand

... was forwarded by the conciliation officer to the... company and was not accepted by the latter would not constitute an industrial dispute."

Their Lordships then considered the decision in *Standard Coal Company Vs. S. P. Verma*, AIR 1952 Pat. 56 and observed that the decision may not be correct as it is opposed to the above Supreme Court decision. Their Lordships also considered the decisions in *Goodyear (India) Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal*, 1968 (11) LLJ. 682 and *Kandan Textile Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal*, AIR 1951 Madras 616 and did not feel inclined to follow them, and summed up the position thus :

"We are of the view that the decision of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529... has finally established the proposition that a demand by the workmen must be raised first on the management and rejected by them before an industrial dispute can be said to arise and exist and that the making of such a demand to the conciliation officer and its communication by him to the management, which reject the same is not sufficient to constitute an industrial dispute. The decisions and dicta of some of the High Courts to the contrary can no longer be considered good law."

12. I shall now undertake, in brief, a survey of the other case-law on this very subject. In *Ramayya Pantulu Vs. Kutty and Rao*, 1949 LLJ. 13, the observation made by the Madras High Court was that a reference would be competent where an industrial dispute exists or is apprehended and this will depend upon the demands made by the workmen and refusal on the part of the management to comply with these demands, which demands and refusal would necessarily involve discussions taking place amongst the workmen and the management. In *Kandan Textile Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal*, 1949 LLJ. 875, the President of the union never made any demand on the management and instead wrote to the Government that an industrial dispute existed in respect of 11 items. The Government made an order of reference in respect of these 11 items, purporting to do so on the basis of two letters of the Labour Commissioner, even though these letters specified the industrial dispute in respect of a different matter not covered by the 11 items. On these facts, the Madras High Court held that the reference was bad. *Rajumannar, C.J.*, based this finding on the ground that the union had not the authority on behalf of the workmen to raise the dispute. Incidentally however, his Lordships further mentioned that there was no evidence that the workmen had made a demand which the employer had refused. *Mack, J.*, agreed with the ultimate decision in the case but made contrary observation about demand and refusal being pre-requisite conditions for the constitution of an industrial dispute. He observed that the two letters of the Labour Commissioner mentioned the existence of an industrial dispute about the insistence on the part of the management to take back some workmen in order of proficiency and not of seniority and this may in law be an industrial dispute brought as it was to the notice of the Government by one of its responsible officers, which would justify a reference on that point. In *Standard Coal Company Limited Vs. S. P. Verma*, AIR 1952 Patna 56, where the colliery had closed down, the President of the Mines Association wrote directly to the Government for intervention to ensure the continued employment of the colliery workers. The workmen also took up the matter separately with the regional Labour Commissioner for the maintenance of the status quo until the dispute was settled. The dispute was further brought to the notice of the Government by the President of a rival union of the colliery. The Regional Labour Commissioner made a report to the Government for making a reference to the Tribunal and in pursuance thereof the Government made such a reference. The contention raised before the Patna High Court was that unless the workmen made a demand upon the employer who refuses it, the demand cannot form the basis of an industrial dispute and in support of this contention the decision in *Kandan Textile Limited* case was pressed in harness. The High Court observed :

"In our opinion, these passages were not intended to be absolute tests applicable in all cases, but if they were so intended us respectfully to differs... on that particular point. There may be instance where

workers may consider it wholly useless to make a demand on the management and prefer to move the appropriate machinery set up by the Government for redress of their grievances. But nevertheless, it will be an industrial dispute if it comes within the meaning of Sec. 2(k) . . . . ."

A somewhat contrary observation was made by the Patna High Court in *Members of Sasamusa Workers' Union Vs. State of Bihar*, AIR 1952 Patna, 210 where a strike notice included 48 demands but the Government made reference only in respect of 4 demands and the contention raised was that the Government was not competent to refer 4 demands only for adjudication. The High Court observed that since there was no material to show that the notice of strike was served upon the management or reasonable opportunity was given to it to comply with the demands of the union, it cannot be held that there was an industrial dispute with reference to 48 demands so as to make out the existence of an industrial dispute. In *Management of Radio Foundation Engineering Limited Vs. State of Bihar*, AIR 1970 Pat. 295 the workmen contended that while the charter of their demands was still under conciliation, the company closed down its work and refused to employ them. The Management resisted this plea on the ground that it had issued notices of termination of service but before that date could arrive, the workmen had unilaterally stopped work without giving notice. The workmen made a grievance about the alleged lock-out to the Government which made a reference for adjudication to the Tribunal. The company pleaded that no dispute was raised by the workmen with it and hence there was no industrial dispute which could be made the subject-matter of adjudication. Reliance for this contention was placed on AIR 1952 Pat. 210 (Supra) and AIR 1968 SC 529 (Supra) that in the absence of a demand and refusal it could not be said that there was in existence any industrial dispute. The High Court observed that something happened during the course of conciliation proceedings, resulting in the stoppage of the workmen from work. Naturally then a dispute arose as to what was the reason for the stoppage of the work and the reason of that stoppage of work was an industrial dispute. On the facts therefore, no specific demand by the workmen was necessary to bring out the existence of an industrial dispute. Their Lordships then proceeded to lay down the following propositions of law :—

"If, therefore, the workmen concerned approached the Government for redress of their grievances because of the alleged lock-out, by bringing the facts to the notice of the Government, it is difficult to accept the contention . . . . . that there was no dispute raised before the management in that regard. The dispute obviously was there which resulted in the stoppage of the work . . . . . In all cases it is not necessary that the dispute must be preceded by a demand and a refusal in express terms by the parties concerned. If on the evidence adduced before the Tribunal it is found that the industrial dispute did not exist or was not apprehended, the reference may be held to be incompetent. But, . . . . . to say that, merely because in express terms no such dispute was raised before the management by the workmen, there was in fact no dispute and hence the reference is incompetent, will not be correct . . . . . It may also well be that if a different kind of demand is made before the management and the reference is of a different kind, then also the reference is incompetent, as was the case before the Supreme Court in AIR 1958 SC 529. The claim put forward before the management was for payment of retrenchment compensation and not for re-instatement, but the demand put forward before the Government was for a re-instatement also . . . . . In the facts of the instant case, the demand . . . . . was to allow them to work. The management would not allow them to work. The resultant of this dispute was an industrial dispute as to the alleged lock-out. No further demand in respect of that dispute was necessary and when a grievance was made before the . . . . . Government by the workmen . . . . . the Government was competent to make a reference . . . . . In *Goodyear (India) Limited vs. Industrial Tribunal*, 1968 (II) LLJ, 682, the Rajasthan High Court also took the view that a

direct demand on the management was not necessary to convert a dispute into an industrial dispute. In that case, the employee whose services had been terminated, moved an application before the conciliation officer, challenging the termination of his service and requesting for re-instatement. The company opposed his re-instatement. The High Court observed that it cannot, in the circumstances, be said that no industrial dispute had been raised by the employee with the company. The High Court, in this connection, distinguished the decision of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529 just on the lines in which it had been distinguished by the Patna High Court in AIR 1970 Pat. 295.

13. The review of the case law will thus indicate that the decision of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529 is not of universal application. For one thing, that decision can have no application to a case where a reference is made not in respect of an existing industrial dispute but in a case of an apprehended industrial dispute, where the question of making a demand and a refusal of that demand, may hardly arise. This point has been elaborately illustrated by the Calcutta High Court in *Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha Limited vs. Fourth Industrial Tribunal*, 1973 (I) 11J 146, wherein the following observation was made :

"In my opinion, . . . . . under Section 10 the dispute which is capable of reference can be either an existing dispute or an apprehended dispute. Therefore under Section 10 a reference is possible even in case where there had been no prior demand or refusal if there is apprehension in the mind of the . . . . . Government that a dispute might arise. The decision of the Supreme Court in . . . . . AIR 1968 SC 529, must be understood in the back-ground of the facts of that case. The said decision did not have occasion to consider whether under Section 10 a dispute which was apprehended could or might be raised and whether in such a case a prior demand or refusal was necessary. . . . In the decision of the Supreme Court, there is no indication as to what transpired before the conciliation officer. It may be that that officer sent a copy of the demand to the Corporation for comments, but it may as well be that the Corporation did not send any comments. It may further be that the Corporation refused to participate in the conciliation proceedings, and did not appear either to accept or reject the demand. Or it may be, that the Corporation appeared before the conciliation officer but there also no demand for re-instatement was made and the demand was confined to the demand for retrenchment compensation only. The decision of the Supreme Court will apply to a case where the facts are similar. Their Lordships have not decided that if a demand is made before a conciliation officer and is rejected by the management, then, in that case also, there would be no industrial dispute. In *Ramayya Pantulu's case*, also there was no decision on the question whether a demand and a refusal made before a conciliation officer will remain a dispute only and not become an industrial dispute. In *Kandan Textile Limited case*, no demand was made even before the conciliation officer: the conciliation officer recommended the reference on another matter, not included in the demands; and the two learned Judges constituting the Bench made contrary observations on the question whether a demand and a refusal are or are not pre-requisites for converting a dispute into an industrial dispute. In *Standard Coal Company's case*, there was a clear law laid down that the demand on the management is not necessary. In *Sasamusa Workers' Union case* which was decided earlier than the *Standard Coal Company's case*, certainly a contrary view was expressed, though the main decision turned on the question whether the Government is or is not competent to ignore some demands and

make reference in respect of others. In Radio Foundation's case there was a categorical decision that a prior demand with the management is not a condition precedent for a dispute to become an industrial dispute. The view taken by the Rajasthan High Court in the Goodyear's case is in consonance with the view of the Patna High Court in the first and the last cases. This Tribunal is subject to the jurisdiction of the Patna High Court, and when the decision of their Lordships of the Supreme Court is distinguishable and as such not applicable to the instant case, I am bound to follow the view propounded by the Patna High Court and, therefore, I hold that the making of a prior demand is not necessary to the raising of an industrial dispute, in all cases. Indeed, in the instant case, there was a confrontation between the union and the Railway Company during the course of conciliation proceedings. The Assistant Labour Commissioner sent a copy of the Union's applications Ext. M-31 to the Railway Company and invited it to participate in the proceedings, vide Ext. M-32. Ext. M-10 is the letter sent by the Railway Company to the Assistant Labour Commissioner resisting the demand of the union. Ext. M-11 is the report of the Assistant Labour Commissioner which mentions that the stand taken by the Railway Company is contained in their letter Ext. M-10. There was, therefore, a demand made by the union and a refusal of that demand by the Railway Company and that, to my mind, is sufficient to make the dispute an industrial dispute.

14. I shall now take up the second proposition of the second contention. The Railway Company is a "Public Limited Company" under the Indian Companies Act. It is not disputed that it carries on an "Industry" within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the Act. Section 71A of the Railway Act, in so far as it is relevant for the present purpose, reads thus :

**71-A. Definition.—**

In this Chapter, unless the context otherwise requires :—

- (a) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "continuous" except when it is excluded or has been declared to be essentially intermittent or intensive ;
- (b) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "essentially intermittent" when it has been declared to be so by the prescribed authority on the ground that the daily hours of duty of the railway servant normally include periods of inaction aggregating six hours or more (including at least one such period of not less than one hour or two such periods of not less than half an hour each), during which the railway servant may be on duty, but is not called upon to display either physical activity or sustained attention ;
- (c) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "excluded", if he belongs to any one of the following categories, namely ;
- (v) such staff as may be specified as supervisory staff by the Central Government by rules made under section 71E. An analysis of Section 71A will reveal that the employment of a railway servant is of four categories, namely :—
  - (1) continuous.
  - (2) essentially intermittent,
  - (3) excluded, and
  - (4) intensive.

Normally, the employment is continuous, except where it is excluded or has been declared to be "essentially intermi-

tent" by the prescribed authority. Section 71-E, in so far as it is applicable to the present purpose, reads :

**71-E. Power to make rules :—**

- (1) The Central Government may make rules —

- (a) prescribing the authorities who may declare that the employment of any railway servant is essentially intermittent ..... ; and providing for appeals against any such declaration and the manner in which, and the conditions subject to which, any such appeal may be filed and heard.

In exercise of its powers under sub-section (1) of Section 71-E, the Central Government made the Railway Servants (Hours of Employment) Rules, 1961. Rules 3 and 4, which are relevant, reads thus :

**3. Power to Classify the Employment of a Railway Servant.—**

- (1) The power to declare the employment of a railway servant as ..... essentially intermittent within the meaning of section 71A shall vest with the Head of the Railway Administration or with an officer not below the rank of a senior scale officer as a temporary measure during the periods of emergency.

- (2) A copy of every declaration made under sub-rule (1) shall be sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner.

**4. Appeals against Classification.—**

- (1) If any question arises in respect of a declaration made under rule 3, the matter shall be referred to the Regional Labour Commissioner whose decision, subject to the provision of sub-rule (2) shall be final.
- (2) Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner may, before the expiry of 30 days from the date on which the decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is communicated to him, prefer an appeal to the Government whose decision thereon shall be final.

The ambit of Rules 3 and 4 is quite clear. The power to declare the employment of a railway servant as essentially intermittent can be exercised either by the Head of the Railway Administration or by any officer provided he is not an officer below the rank of a senior scale officer. The power can be exercised as a temporary measure and that also during a period of emergency. A copy of every declaration of classification has to be sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner. An exercise of the power in contravention of Rule 3 will be illegal and invalid. The effect of a validly declared classification is final, if not challenged under sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 before a Regional Labour Commissioner. In case the railway servants affected by the declaration wish to challenge its propriety or validity, they have to raise that question before the Regional Labour Commissioner. If his decision turns in favour of the railway servants, the Railway Administration or the Railway Company may file an appeal before the Government ; while if the decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is against the railway servants, they may similarly appeal to the Government. The decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is final, where no appeal is made, and where an appeal is made by either side, it is the decision of the Government which becomes final. The Traffic Manager of the Railway Company, in exercise of the powers under Rule 3, made the first declaration Ext. M-1 on January 21/25, 1974 whereby he converted the continuous service of each Station Master/Assistant Station Master to essentially intermittent between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road railway stations. By the second declaration Ext. W-2 dated January 30, 1974, he converted the continuous service of all Pointsman also into essentially intermittent and extended the first, as also the second, declaration over the entire route. The effect of these declarations was admittedly to enhance the duty hours from 8 to 12 which is within the permissible limits under section 71C. It has been seen earlier that the declarations were, as required by sub-rule (2) of Rule 3, sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner. This fact has been asserted in categorical terms in paragraph 24 of the written statement of the Railway Company and has not been denied or controverted by the union in para 24 of its rejoinder. It must be taken, therefore, that the Railway Company fully complied

with this requirement of the rule. It is admitted that the union did not raise any question about the propriety, correction or validity of the declarations before the Regional Labour Commissioner inviting him to give his decision on the question and consequently no question of an appeal, arose in the matter. The union submitted to the two declarations without demur and without agitating it before the competent authority, in the manner, required by the Rule. These two declarations, therefore, took the shape of finality. The union has, however, challenged both the propriety and the validity of the two declarations before the Tribunal for a variety of reasons, namely,

- (1) The declarations are invalid for non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 9A of the Act.
- (2) They are bad because they were not issued by the prescribed authority,
- (3) They are bad because they are the result of malafides,
- (4) They are bad because they amount to unfair labour practice,
- (5) They are bad because they were issued when there was no emergency; and
- (6) They are again bad because they applied to a prolonged period of time and were not intended to be purely as a temporary measure.

None of these contentions, however, is sustainable either in law or, where they are founded on fact, on fact.

15. Section 9A of the Act, relevant for our present purpose, reads thus :

9A. Notice of change.—No employer, who proposes to effect any change in the conditions of service applicable to any workman in respect of any matter specified in the Fourth Schedule, shall effect such change,—

(a) without giving to the workmen likely to be affected by such change a notice in the prescribed manner of the nature of the change proposed to be affected; or

(b) within twenty-one days of giving such notices :

Provided that no notice shall be required for effecting any such change—

(b) where the workmen likely to be affected by the change are persons to whom ..... any other rules or regulations that may be notified in this behalf by the appropriate Government in the Official Gazette, apply.

The Fourth Schedule as the title "conditions of service for change of which notice is to be given"; and item 4 of this schedule reads "Hours of work and rest intervals". The contention of the union is that it is a condition of service of railway servants that their duty hours will be 8 and since this was enhanced from 8 to 12 without compliance with Section 9A by giving notice, and without waiting for the expiry of the statutory period of 21 days, the declarations are bad. Section 2(k) uses two phrases: "the terms of employment" and "conditions of labour" while Section 9A uses the words "conditions of service". It can admit of no doubt that the expressions "term of employment" and conditions of service" or "conditions of labour" certainly cover hours of work. See *Secretary, Madras Gymkhana Club Employees' Union Vs. Gymkhana Club*, AIR 1968 SC 554. The expression "terms of employment" is wider in scope than the expression "conditions of service". See *Ram Nath Koeri Vs. Lakshmi Devi Sugar Mills*, 1956 (II) LLJ 11. The employment is the contract of service between the employer and the employees whereunder the employees agree to serve the employer, subject to the terms of employment. The conditions of employment may be laid down by a contract or by law or by an order, executive or statutory, of a Government. If the hours of work are a term of a contract of service entered into between the employer and his employees, these may not be absolute and will, in all cases, be subject to and can be

regulated by a law on the subject. Where, however, the hours of work are controlled and regulated by statute or by a rule or regulation made thereunder, it will be these hours of work which will be binding on the employers and the employees. The power to classify the employment of railway servants as continuous, essentially intermittent, excluded or intensive is a statutory power under Section 71A read with Section 71E, of the Railways Act and if the power is exercised under rule 3, the effect in duty hours is that a railway servant whose employment is essentially intermittent may have to work for 12 hours and a railway servant whose employment is excluded may have to work all the 24 hours. This will be on the basis of exercise of statutory power to classify the employment of railway servants and not by way of a change in the conditions of labour or in the conditions of service. As has been stated earlier, the terms of employment with regard to duty hours in the case of railway servants is not a matter of contract or a matter of conditions of service, but is essentially one which pertains to a statutory power to classify the employment of such servants. The union has not filed any document to show that there is any written conditions of their service: nor have they filed their letters of appointment to indicate that there was an express stipulation governing their duty hours: and, the Standing Orders Ext. M-17 also do not contain any order regulating duty hours. Section 9A of the Act appears to have no application to railway servants, whether they belong to the Indian Railways or to Railway companies. Section 9A itself says that no notice shall be required for effecting any such change in respect of item 4 of the Fourth Schedule where the workmen likely to be affected by the change are persons to whom any other rule and regulation that may be notified in this behalf by the appropriate Government in the Official Gazette, apply. The Railway Servants (Hours of Employment) Rules are rules in this category, to which Section 9A has no application. I am, therefore, of the view that the Railway Company was entitled to reclassify the employment of all its railway servants from continuous to essentially intermittent without compliance with Section 9A of the Act. It was held in *May and Baker (India) Limited Vs. Their workmen*, 1961 (II) LLJ 94 and in *Workmen of Hindustan Shipyard (P) Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal*, 1961 (II) LLJ 526 that an employer has the power to vary the working hours within statutory limits; and this is what has been done, in the instant case, by the Railway Company also. To the same effect is the decision in the *Oil and Natural Gas Commission Vs. the Workmen*, AIR 1973 SC 968. One has only to substitute the phrase "classification of employment" for the phrase "working hours".

16. The above discussion will show that the two declarations issued by the Railway Company do not create any industrial dispute, even though they may be disputed by the union, because the Act has no application at all. The Tribunal is, therefore, precluded from going into that question and, for that matter, into the further questions whether they were not issued by the prescribed authority, whether they are the result of malafides, whether they amount to unfair labour practice, whether they were for a prolonged period or purely as a temporary measure, and whether there was any emergency or not. The Tribunal will have no jurisdiction to go into these matters for several reasons. Firstly, the dispute being not an industrial dispute, the Tribunal has no power to decide these matters. Secondly, if there was malafides if there was unfair labour practice, if there was no temporary measure, if there was no emergency, if the declarations had not been made by the prescribed authority, if they were bad for any other analogous reasons, all these questions should have been raised by the union before the Regional Labour Commissioner who was the only authority statutorily competent to entertain, hear and decide these points: and whose decision, the law says, would be final, unless an appeal was made to the Government. All these matters are foreign to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. It is a case where the remedy open to the union was not availed of, and the remedy not open to it, is being pressed in service.

17. However, all these matters were argued at great length by both sides, and if I may say so, with great vehemence and fervour, and therefore, I wish to say a few words on merits also. The two declarations were issued by the Traffic Manager. The learned counsel for the union argued that the Traffic Manager was not a senior scale officer and, therefore, he had not the power to issue these declarations. No such plea was raised expressly, or even by implication.

in the rejoinder. The Railway Company cannot be allowed to be taken by surprise during the course of arguments. Had the plea been raised, it would have been forewarned and might have taken necessary steps to file the gradation list to show that the Traffic Manager was a senior scale officer. In the evidence, Phulendra Prasad, MW-2 deposed that the Secretary of the Railway Company is the Head of the Railway Administration, whereas A. Kumar, the Traffic Manager, is the head of the Traffic department, and is second only to the Head of the Railway Company. He further stated that the scale of pay of the Traffic Manager is Rs. 1800—2500, besides certain other perquisites. The Central Pay Commission's Report shows that a scale of Rs. 1800 to 2500 is a senior scale. There is, therefore, no merits in this contention. The first declaration lasted during the period January 25, 1974 to February 13, 1974 and the second declaration applied to the period January 30, 1974 to February 13, 1974, vide Ext. W-1, W-2 and M-9. The first one had a duration of 20 days and the second one a duration of 15 days. One cannot, therefore, designate these short durations as prolonged: they are obviously temporary in nature. The question of malafides and emergency are interlinked and hinge upon the same evidence. It is not disputed that even before the issue of these two declarations, there were two Station Masters and one Pointman in the "excluded" category, and one Assistant Station Master and thirty-six Pointsmen in the "essentially intermittent" category. It is only the rest that were declared to be in "essentially intermittent" employment by changing their classification from the category of "continuous" employment. This was done, plainly, to my mind, when the Railway Company was faced with an emergency. There is a complex of industries, collectively called Rohtas Industries at Dalmianagar. Its subsidiary industries are paper, cement, chemicals, Vanaspathi etc. In addition to Rohtas Industries, there is another cement factory called the Ashoka Cement Limited. The Rohtas Industries Cement Factory and the Ashoka Cement Limited between themselves consume about 2000 tonnes of limestone as raw material and produce about 12,50 tonnes of cement per day, a fact which has not been denied by the union which felt satisfied by stating in its rejoinder that it has no comments to offer. The General Secretary of the Dalmianagar Mazdoor Sewa Sangh served a strike notice upon the Rohtas Industries and Ashoka Cement Limited on December 11, 1973 of their intention to go on strike. The Joint Secretary of the Dalmianagar Mazdoor Union served a similar notice upon Rohtas Industries and Ashoka Cement Limited on December 31, 1973. The above will appear from Ext. M-1 and M-2. Ext. M-3 is a charter of their demands. The Government of Bihar even prohibited the staging of the strike under Rule 119 of the Defence of India Rules by notification Ext. M-5 dated February 11, 1974. The Parshva Properties Limited is the sole supplier of limestone to these cement factories from its quarries at Tiua Pipradih and Rohtas. Due to the strike in the two cement factories, the manufacture of cement came to a halt and affected the quarrying of limestone at Tiua Pipradih and Rohtas, with the result that Parshva Properties Limited laid-off its workers from January 28 1974 as there was no stocking place left at the site of the quarries. Ext. M-12 is a chart showing movement of Goods Trains during the period January 14, 1974 to February 13, 1974. Before the declarations, 35 Goods Trains ran during the period January 14 to January 24, just preceding the date of the first declaration, giving an average of 3.5 Goods Trains per day. January 14 to January 24 is a part of the period of strike in the two cement factories. Only 21 Goods Trains ran during January 25 to February 13 during which the two declarations were in force, giving an average of one Goods Train per day. On January 25, 27 and 28 three such trains ran; On January 26 and February 2 only two such trains ran; On January 29, 30, 31st and February 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 only one Goods Train ran, and on February 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 no Goods Trains were at all run. Before the period of strike, during the period of normalcy, 8 pairs of goods trains used to cover the route daily. It is not difficult to imagine, therefore that during the period of strike, there was not much custom to carry Ext. M-13 shows that in the year 1971 limestone carried was 6,65,883 tonnes as against other goods to the extent of 1,10,443 tonnes; in the year 1972 the limestone carried was 6,75,641 and other goods 1,03,302 respectively in the year 1973 the tonnage was 5,58,856 and 54,884 respectively; and in the year 1974 the tonnage upto August 5, 1974 was 48,383 and 8,415 respectively. The income during the four years upto August 5, 1974 was Rs. 55,82,707; Rs. 56,25,602, 56,08,964 and 5,36,201 respectively. Ext. M-14 shows that limestone carried during January 1974 was 32,661 tonnes as against other goods to the extent of

7,028 tonnes. Ext. M-15 is a statement showing the duties of Pointsmen during the period when the two declarations were in force. Ext. M-16 is another statement showing the duties of Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters during the same period. It is worthy of note that even though the two cement factories stopped manufacturing cement with effect from January 13 when the workmen of these two factories went on strike, the Railway Company did not classify the employment of its servants with effect from that date but waited from January 13 to January 24 for a full period of 12 days, and then alone issued the first declaration and it is only when Parshva Properties Limited stopped quarrying on January 27 when the company issued the second declaration on January 30. It does not appear to have been the intention of the Railway Company to act by way of malafides merely to take more work from its servants. The raw material depleted and then disappeared and there was little the Railway Company could carry. Its funds started dwindling and it had to lay-off some of its employees and take more work from the depleted strength of the staff by re-classifying their employment. It does not follow as a matter of fact that the Railway servants had actually to work overtime merely because they were made to work for 12 hours instead of 8. The work load was not the same, and indeed, much less, because of the curtailment in Goods Trains service. The period of 12 hours compressed periods of activity and periods of in-action because either no trains were running or very few were on the run. In the circumstance it is not possible to hold that the declarations were the result of malafides, or there was no emergency. There can be no question of unfair labour practices also when the declarations were made in the circumstances above mentioned. There was no victimisation etc. The old classification was revived of Feb. 14 when the strike were stopped. However, as stated earlier, these questions do not fall for determination before the Tribunal in view of the fact that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction over them.

18. The next contention is that there was in existence a binding settlement between the parties which was still in operation and, therefore, the declarations could not be made so as to infringe the settlement. There is no substance in this contention also. The tenability of the point is not open to the decision of the Tribunal. It could have been pleaded before the Regional Labour Commissioner but as stated earlier, the declarations, in so far as the Tribunal is concerned, are final and sacrosanct and cannot be touched. It appears that the recognised union had served a notice of strike on the Railway Company on 4/5th March, 1970 and had also submitted a charter of demands on May 26, 1969. As a result of this, mutual negotiations took place between the two and there came into existence a settlement which was to be effective from April 1, 1970. One of the terms of the settlement was that the Railway Company would employ 12 Pointsmen to change over the duty hours from essentially intermittent to continuous, with regard to five Railway Stations. This settlement is Ext. W-4. It was arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceedings Section 2(p) read with Rule 58 of the Central Rules required the settlement to be signed by the parties thereto in such manner as has been prescribed and a copy thereto has to be sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer. I may take it that the settlement is in Form 'H' as it is in substantial compliance with that form, and I may further take it that it was sent to the appropriate authority. Under sub-section (1) of Section 18, a settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and the workmen otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement, and not on those who are not parties to it. The settlement had been entered into between the Railway Company and the recognised union and not by the union and, therefore, the union cannot take advantage of it. Besides clause (b) of Demand No. 34 in the settlement says that both the parties agree that during the pendency of this agreement... the employees shall not raise any general demand involving financial obligations. The union has raised such a demand by claiming for payment of overtime. Clause (a) of Demand No. 34 mentions that the agreement is a composite settlement and no party can have the benefit of one term to the exclusion of any other term and if any party seeks to do so, it is open to the other party to treat itself automatically free from the entire agreement. In the circumstance, therefore, for the reasons stated above, the settlement does not come into the picture at all. Moreover no contract can override a statute, as it will be violative of Public policy.



19. The last contention of the learned counsel for the Railway Company is that the reference itself is bad on two grounds, namely (1) that the Government had no material before it on which it could base its opinion that there was in existence an industrial dispute and (2) that the dispute referred is in respect of the justification or otherwise of change in the working hours whereas it should have been whether Section 9A of the Act was applicable or not to the Railway Company in view of Section 71A, Section 71-F and Rule 3 made under Section 71-E of the Railways Act. These pleas, to my mind, are too technical to require any consideration and particularly so when a Tribunal should not ordinarily embroil itself with more technicalities in the administration of social justice. It may be that the order of reference as framed is a little ambiguous, and calls for a probing into the actual dispute in order to find out what exactly was referred to the Tribunal. It is well-settled that when a dispute arises as to the exact scope of the question referred, it is open to the Tribunal to look into the claim petitions and the statements filed before it in order to understand what was the exact dispute that was sought to be referred. The pleas clearly show that the real dispute is as to whether the Railway Company had or had not the power to classify the employment of its servants, without due compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 9A. Both the parties know their positions in the matter, and on that basis they filed their respective written statement and rejoinders, and not only that, but adduced evidence in support of their respective contentions and also raised arguments in that regard. I, therefore, reject this contention of the Railway Company.

20. In view of the totality of my findings, the action of the Railway Company in classifying the employment of Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters/Pointsmen involving the enhancement of the duty hours from 8 to 12, is legal and justified; and that being so the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

Sd/-

K. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-41012/10/74/LR III/D II(B)]  
HARBANS BAHADUR, Section Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1976

कां०प्रा० 2724—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी०टी० शिवपकाशम् को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अधीन विरचित स्कीम और कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबन्धित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में, जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएं हो, सम्पूर्ण तमिलनाडु राज्य और पांडिचेरी के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(9)/75-पी०एफ० I]

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1976

S.O. 2724.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. T. Sivapakasam to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(9)/75-PF. I]

कां०प्रा० 2725.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के

भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०प्रा० 3753 तारीख 26 अक्टूबर, 1968 को, अज्ञात तक इसका सन्तुष्ट श्रीमती ए० श्री० सुक्तांकर से है, विवक्षित करती है।

[संख्या 20(65)/64-पी०एफ० I]

S.O. 2725.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3753 dated the 26th October, 1968 so far as it relates to Shrimati A. B. Sukthankar.

[No. 20(65)/64-PF. I]

कां०प्रा० 2726—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एम०वी० मोरे को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अधीन विरचित स्कीम और कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबन्धित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में, जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएं हो, सम्पूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(2)/75-पी०एफ० I]

S.O. 2726.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. V. More to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Maharashtra for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(2)/75-PF I]

कां०प्रा० 2727—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एम०के० तालेगांवकर की उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल-क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबन्धित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएं हो, सम्पूर्ण गुजरात राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(9)/75-पी०एफ० I(i)]

S.O. 2727.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. K. Talegaonkar to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Gujarat for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government, or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(9)/75-PF. I(i)]

कां० 2728—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एन० जी० देसाई की उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी कुटुम्ब पेशन के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उनके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों, सम्पूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य और गोवा दमण और दीव संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(17)/75-पी०एफ० I]

S.O. 2728.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N. G. Desai to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Maharashtra and the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A 12016(17)/75-PF. I]

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1976

कां० 2729—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० 711 तारीख 1 मार्च, 1974 को, अधिष्ठाते करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी० एस० धोत्रेकर को उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उनके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कंपनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों, सम्पूर्ण बिहार राज्य के लिये निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016/(15)/73-पी०एफ० I(ii)]

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1976

S.O. 2729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 711 dated the 1st March, 1974, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. S. Dhotrekar to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Bihar for the purposes of the said Act, the scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A. 12016 (15)/73-PF. I(ii)]

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1976

कां० 2730—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों

का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० 2968 तारीख 21-8-1975 के अनुक्रम में 'व इंडियन ग्रामल कारपोरेशन लि० (विपणन खण्ड) आरामपुर, कानपुर-9 को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से 4 अप्रैल, 1976 से 3 अप्रैल, 1977 तक (जिसमें यह दिन भी सम्मिलित है) एक वर्ष की अवधि के छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अर्थात् :—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की वादन जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् 'उक्त अवधि' कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियाँ, ऐसे प्ररूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की वादन देनी थी,

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त कि या गया कोई निरीक्षक या निगम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

(i) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की वादन दी गई किसी विवरणी की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या

(ii) यह अभिविधित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथाप्रोक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख, उक्त अवधि के लिये रखे गए थे या नहीं; या

(iii) यह अभिविधित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिये गये उन फायदों को, जिसके फलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है या नहीं; या

(iv) यह अभिविधित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये सशक्त होगा :—

(क) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझती है; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक के अधिभोगाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वे व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संवाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें, या उन्हें ऐसा जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक की, उसके अधिकर्ता या सेवक की, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाये, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्ति-युक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।



## व्यावसायिक भाषण

इस मामले में पूर्वापेक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई है क्योंकि छूट के नवीकरण के लिये अपेक्षित सूचना देर से मिली थी। तथापि, यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि जिन परिस्थितियों में कारखाने को आरम्भ में छूट स्वीकृत की गई थी वे अभी भी विद्यमान हैं और कारखाना छूट का पात्र है। यह भी प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वापेक्षी प्रभाव से छूट की स्वीकृति किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं डालेगी।

[संख्या एस-38017/8/74-ए० आई०]

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1976

**S.O. 2730.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 2968 dated the 21st August, 1975 the Central Government hereby exempts the Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Marketing Division) Arampore, Kanpur-9 from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 4th April, 1976 upto and inclusive of the 3rd April, 1977.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act, or other Official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

- (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) or section 44 for the said period; or
- (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification, or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory; be empowered to —

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

## EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case, as the required information for renewal of exemption was received late. However, it is certified that the conditions under which the factory was initially granted exemption still persist and the factory is eligible for exemption. It is also certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

[No. S-38017/8/74-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई 1976

क्र० आ० 2731.—यतः मेघालय राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में श्री जे० सी० नामपुयी के स्थान पर श्री एस० मारवेइन सचिव, मेघालय सरकार श्रम विभाग, शिलांग को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा नियम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिये नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1517, तारीख 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद्द 19 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

श्री एस० मारवेइन,  
सचिव,  
मेघालय सरकार,  
श्रम विभाग, शिलांग

[संख्या यू-160125/76-ए०आई०]

एस० एम० सहस्रानामन, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1976

**S.O. 2731.**—Whereas the State Government of Meghalaya has, in pursuance of clause (d) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri S. Marwein, Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya, Labour Department, Shillong, to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation in place of Shri J. C. Nampui.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(nominated by the State Governments under clause (d) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 19, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

Shri S. Marwein,  
Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,  
Labour Department, Shillong.

[No. U-16012/5/76-HI]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1976

**S.O. 2732.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1976.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
AT CALCUTTA**

**Reference No. 59 of 1975**

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank,

**AND**

Their Workmen.

**APPEARANCE :**

On behalf of Employers—Sri G. D. Maheswari, Law Officer, Personnel.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri A. D. Singh, President, Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association.

State : West Bengal

**INDUSTRY : Banking**

**AWARD**

By Order No. L. 12012/97/75/DII/A dated 6th September, 1975, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen, to this tribunal for adjudication. The reference reads as :

“Whether the claim of Sri Deep Chand Kapoor for posting as Head Cashier at the Burrabazar Branch of the Allahabad Bank is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workmen entitled?”

2. Claim for special allowance by the bank employees was settled under the Settlement dated 19-10-1966 between the bank managements and their workmen. Paragraph 5.2 of the aforesaid settlement provides the special allowance payable to Asstt. Head Cashiers upto Head-Cashiers in Category E (they are enumerated as items xii to xviii in Part I under Paragraph 5.2 referred to above). The amount of the allowance had been increased in each of these cases under the later settlement dated 12-10-1970. Sri Deep Chand Kapoor was a Head Cashier of Category A at Bhowanipur branch of Allahabad Bank in Calcutta in 1972, when he was drawing an allowance of Rs. 33/- per mensem. This was so because there was only a unit of 4 clerks. Under A category if the unit was of 5 clerks and above the allowance would be Rs. 43/- in the same category. On behalf of Sri Kapoor it was contended that a vacancy of a Head-Cashier who was to be paid Rs. 43 as allowance occurred in Burrabazar branch of the Bank on 1-8-1972; but he was not appointed to that vacancy. On the other hand, it is contended that the management did not fill up that vacancy until 18-7-1973 and later one Nanak Chandra Khetri was appointed to that vacancy with effect from 18-7-1973. And on behalf of Shri Kapoor it was contended that he would be entitled to be appointed to the post of Head Cashier of Burrabazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 getting an allowance of Rs. 43/- per mensem.

3. It is relevant to point out that the seniority inter se among the staff of the Bank was determined as per the Rules mentioned in Ext. M-2. The special allowance of the bank cashiers was determined under a separate agreement, Ext. M-1 dated 22-9-1973 by which the category of cashiers were classified as category A, Category B, Category C, and Category E depending upon the quantity of the money deposit of each branch. Category B is not applicable to this case. Branch comes under this category A if the deposit is less than Rs. 50 lakhs; it comes under Category C if the deposit is above Rs. 50 lakhs; it comes under Category E if the deposit is One crore of rupees and above. The cashiers will get Rs. 33, Rs. 55 and Rs. 85 respectively in each of these banks. After Ext. M-1 agreement came into force Shri

Kapoor was appointed at Bhowanipore branch with an allowance of Rs. 85 with effect from 29-11-1973. At that time he was already acting on a special allowance of Rs. 55/- with effect from 31-10-1973 at the same office. It is also relevant to point out that he was paid the proportionate amount of special allowance with effect from 21-10-73 since Shri Khetri had also been promoted to category E with effect from 21-10-1973. So Shri Kapoor had no complaint with regard to his allowance. He had drawn at the rate of Rs. 85/- per mensem with effect from 21-10-1973. Between him and Shri Khetri there could be no dispute with regard to the payment of special allowance from 21-10-1973. Both of them got the same rate of allowance under Category E Head Cashier.

4. However, the dispute centres round the question whether Shri Kapoor would be entitled as of right to claim a transfer to Burrabazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 or at least to reimburse him special allowance at the rate of Rs. 43/- from 1-8-1972 to 21-10-1973. First of all the Union or the workman concerned did not produce any evidence to show that the management withheld the posting of any Head cashier at Burrabazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 and until 18-7-1973, when the vacancy was offered to Shri Khetri. In the absence of any evidence the right to keep open the vacancy at Burrabazar branch from 1-8-1972 to 18-7-1973 appears to be a managerial right, which cannot be questioned. It is for the management to decide to fill up the vacancy or keep it vacant. It would depend upon several factors which the management alone could decide. So, Shri Kapoor could not claim as matter of right any transfer to Burrabazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972, much less to claim the relative special allowance for the period ending with 18-7-1973.

5. The next question is whether Shri Kapoor could be paid the allowance at the rate of Rs. 43/- per mensem from 18-7-73 to 21-10-1973. It is admitted that there are other employees who are senior to Shri Kapoor in the Head Head Cashiers' posts and as such Shri Kapoor could not claim any preference over Shri Khetri. It is also stated that Shri Khetri is senior to Shri Kapoor. There is no rule that an Asstt. Cashier could not be placed in charge of the work of A category Head Cashier. It is not a cadre promotion. The Tribunal can interfere only if there is discrimination inter se between two employees in the matter of selection for payment of special allowance. The dispute has never been between Shri Kapoor and Shri Khetri for identical post of Head Cashier. If that be so, Shri Kapoor would not have been a rival to Shri Khetri since there were other employees declared to be senior to Shri Kapoor. Shri Kapoor, therefore, could not establish any discrimination much less any injustice in this case. There is no basis in his claim for transfer or for special allowance.

6. In the result, the Reference is answered against the workman. An Award is passed accordingly.

[No. L. 12012/97/75/D.II(A)]

Dated, Calcutta,

E. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer

The 29th June, 1976.

S.O. 2733.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 2nd July, 1976.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR  
(M.P.)**

**PRESENT :**

SHRI S. N. JOHRI, M.Sc., LL.M. —Presiding Officer.

**Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (7) of 1975**

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Indore and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, State Bank of Indore Karamchari Sangh, 30, Bakshi Gali, Indore (M.P.)

## APPEARANCES :

For workmen—None

For employers—None.

INDUSTRY : Bank

DISTRICT : Indore (M.P.)

## AWARD

Dated : June 26, 1976

Government of India in the Labour Department referred the following industrial dispute for the adjudication by this Tribunal vide their Order No. L-12012/93/74-LR. III-DII(A) dated 10th February, 1975 :—

“Whether the demand of the State Bank of the Indore Karamchari Sangh, Indore, that Shri Mohan Gangaram, Cash Peon, Prince Yeshwant Road Branch of the State Bank of Indore should be paid the cash peon allowance for the period from the 1st February, 1972 to the 8th August, 1972 is justified ? If so, to what relief is he entitled ?”

2. The parties have entered into a settlement and have sent a memorandum of settlement signed by both the parties and the workman concerned. It has been stated therein that the amount of claim has been paid by the management and prayed that in view of the above settlement a no dispute award be given. The award is given accordingly. The settlement petition shall form part of the award.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12012/93/74-LR III]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, 724 NAPIER TOWN, JABALPUR (M.P.)

## I. D. No. CGIT/LC (R) (7)/75

In the matter of Industrial Dispute

## BETWEEN

The Management of State Bank of Indore, Head Office, 5 Yeshwant Niwas Road, Indore

## AND

Its workmen : Shri Mohan Gangaram, Cash Peon, B. O. P. Y. Road, Indore as represented by State Bank of Indore Karamchari Sangh, 30, Bakshi Gali, Indore.

It is submitted :—

1. That as the amount of claim has been paid by the Management, no dispute in this regard exists.

2. That in view of the above, this Hon'ble Tribunal is prayed to pass 'No Dispute' Award.

Sd/- Illegible.

23-6-1976.

Indore

Dated the 23rd June, 1976.

30, Bakshi Gali, Indore.

Sd/- M. L. Kashmiri

General Secretary,

State Bank of Indore

Karamachari Sangh,

Accepted.

Sd/- Mohan (In Hindi)

(Mohan Gangaram)

Cash Peon,

State Bank of Indore,

B. O. P. Y. Road, Indore.

## PART OF AWARD

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer  
26-6-1976

नई दिल्ली, 12, जुलाई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2734.—खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सर्वश्री दशरथसिंह और राजा राम को मुख्य खान निरीक्षक के मातहत खान निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल संख्या ए-12025/5/74-एम-I (ii

जे० सी० सक्सेना, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1976

S.O. 2734.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952, (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints S/Shri Dasharath Singh and Raja Ram as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. A-12025/5/74-M. I(ii)]

J. C. SAXENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1976

S.O. 2735.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dharmaband Colliery of M/s. BCC Ltd. P. O. Malkera, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5-7-76.

## BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

## Reference No. 4 of 1975

(Ministry's Order No. L-2012/95/74-LRII, Dt. 31-1-1975)

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Dharmaband Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Malkera, Distt. Dhanbad.

## AND

Their Workmen.

## PRESENT :

## APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

For the Workmen—None.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 1st July, 1976

## AWARD

The Central Government, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Is the action of the management of Dharmaband Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Malkera, District Dhanbad in refusing to allow Shri Chhotu Mian, Miner to resume his duty with effect from the 20th June, 1973 justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The reference was made on January 31, 1975, but some three and a half months earlier, on October 10, 1974 to be precise, Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and the Vice President, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, had patched up their differences on the basis of a mutual settlement (Annexure I). They filed Annexure-I before the Tribunal on June 28, 1976 along with a joint petition praying that the Tribunal should give its award in terms of Annexure-I. The joint petition states that the settlement arrived at between them, has already been implemented also, and no matter is any longer in dispute.

3. In these circumstances, the award is given in terms of the settlement (Annexure I), which shall form part of the award.

K. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

[F. No. L-2012/95/74-LR II/D III A]

S. H. S. IYER, Section Officer.

## ANNEXURE-1

Memorandum of settlement arrived at between the Sub-Area Manager for the Management of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dharmaband Sub-Area-IV and the Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union over alleged illegal and arbitrary refusal of work to Sri Chhutu Mian, Miner of Dharmaband Colliery from 20-6-74.

The Vice-President, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union raised an Industrial Dispute before the A.L.C. (C) regarding alleged illegal and arbitrary refusal of work to Sri Chhutu Mian, Miner from 20-6-74. The conciliation ended in a failure. After some time Sri Rajnandan Singh again represented to reconsider the employment of Sri Chhutu Mian. After long discussion between the Union and the Sub-Area Manager, the dispute was mutually settled.

## TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

1. It was agreed that Sri Chhutu Mian would be given employment in Dharmaband Colliery in his original job from the day he reports for duty.

2. That Sri Chhutu Mian would report for his duties immediately but not later than 19th October, 1974.

3. That the period from 20-6-74 till the date of resumption of his duties would be treated as leave without pay.

Signature of the representative of the Workmen.

Signature of the representative of the Management.

1. Sd/- Rajnandan Singh

2. Sd/- ILLEGIBLE

Secretary, Bihar

Colliery Kamgar Union

1. S. M. Koley, SAM

2.

## WITNESSES:—

1. Sd/- S. S. Mitra

2. Sd/- Haroo Bouri.

## दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

सार्वजनिक सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 24 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2736.—दिल्ली डेवेलपमेंट एक्ट, 1957 की धारा 11 (1957 की सं० 61) के अन्तर्गत सूचना :

एतद्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि :—

(ए) केन्द्रीय सरकार ने दिल्ली डेवेलपमेंट एक्ट, 1957 (1957 की सं० 61) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (2) के अन्तर्गत जोन सी-14 (तिमार पुर), सी-15 (किंगजवे कैम्प) तथा सी-19 (मॉडल टाउन) के जोनल डेवेलपमेंट प्लान को स्वीकृति प्रदान कर दी है।

(बी) समस्त कार्यशील दिनों में प्रातः 11.00 बजे से अपराह्न 3.00 बजे तक दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कार्यालय, विकास मीनार, म्यारहवीं मंजिल, मुख्य योजना अनुभाग, इन्द्रप्रस्थ इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 में आकर स्वीकृत योजना चित्र का निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[सं० एक० 4(30)166-एम०पी०]

हृदय नाथ फोतेदार, सचिव

## DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

## PUBLIC NOTICE

New Delhi, the 24th July, 1976

S.O. 2736.—Notice under Section 11 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (No. 61 of 1957):

Notice is hereby given that :—

(a) The Central Government have, under Sub-section (2) of Section 9 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (No. 61 of 1957), approved the zonal development plan for zones C-14 (Timarpur), C-15 (Kingsway Camp) and C-19 (Model Town).

(b) A copy of the plan as approved may be inspected at the office of the Delhi Development Authority, Vikas Minar, 11th Floor, Master Plan Section, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi-110001, between the hours of 11.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. on all working days.

[No. F. 4 (30)/66-MP]

H. N. FOTEDAR, Secy.

## वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बैंकिंग विभाग)

(राजस्व पक्ष)

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 1976

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 2737.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) का धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार महाराष्ट्र राज्य वित्तीय निगम, मुम्बई को, उक्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले एक करोड़ पैंसठ लाख रुपये अंकित मूल्य के डिबेंचरों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क मद्धे प्रभाय एक लाख तेईस हजार सात सौ पचास रुपये मात्र समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क का संवाय करने की अनुज्ञा देती है।

[सं० 35/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/40/76-सीमाशुल्क-II]

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**  
(Department of Revenue & Banking)  
(Revenue Wing)

**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 17th July, 1976

**STAMPS**

**S.O. 2737.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Maharashtra State Financial Corporation, Bombay, to pay consolidated stamp duty of one lakh, twenty-three thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of one crore and sixty-five lakhs of rupees issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 35/76-Stamps—F. No. 471/40/76-Cus. VII]

**आदेश**

का० आ० 2738—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 का उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रिय सरकार, महाराष्ट्र औद्योगिक विकास निगम, मुंबई को, उक्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले तीन करोड़ पचासी लाख रुपए अंकित मूल्य के डिबेंचरों के रूप में बन्धपत्र पर स्टाम्प शुल्क मद्दे प्रभार्य दो लाख अठासी हजार सात सौ पचास रुपये मात्र समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क का संदाय करने का अनुज्ञा देती है।

[सं० 36/76-स्टाम्प—का० सं० 471/41/76-सीमाशुल्क-VII]

ओ० पी० मेहरा, उप सचिव

**ORDER**

**S.O. 2738.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation, Bombay, to pay consolidated stamp duty of two lakhs, eighty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of three crores, eighty-five lakhs of rupees issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 36/76-Stamps—F. No. 471/41/76-Cus. VIII]

O. P. MEHRA, Dy. Secy.

**निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2739.—राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियमों के नियम 45 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) तृतीय संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

50 GI/76—6

2. सरकारी निवास स्थान आबंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में, अनुसूचक नियम 317-ख-8 में,—

(क) उप नियम (1) में,

(1) खण्ड (i) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित खण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(i) महिला अधिकारियों का पूल, विवाहित महिला अधिकारियों और अविवाहित महिला अधिकारियों के लिए पृथक्-पृथक्; और;”

(ii) निम्नलिखित स्पष्टीकरण अन्त में जोड़ा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

स्पष्टीकरण—खण्ड (i) में,—

(क) “विवाहित महिला अधिकारी” से ऐसी महिला अधिकारी अभिप्रेत है, जिसका विवाह अस्तित्व में है और जो अपने पति से न्यायिक रूप से पृथक् नहीं हुई है;

(ख) “अविवाहित महिला अधिकारी” से ऐसी महिला अधिकारी अभिप्रेत है, जो विवाहित महिला अधिकारी नहीं है।”

[का० सं० 12033(4)/76-नीति-II]

**MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING**

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1976

**S.O. 2739.**—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Third Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, in Supplementary Rule 317-B-8,—

(a) in sub-rule (1),—

(i) for clause (i), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

“(i) Lady Officers Pools separately for married lady officers and for single lady officers; and

(ii) The following Explanation shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“EXPLANATION: In clause (i),—

(a) “married lady officer” means a lady officer whose marriage is subsisting and who is not judicially separated from her husband;

(b) “Single lady officer” means a lady officer who is not a married lady officer.”

(b) in sub-rule (4), in clause (a), for the words “Lady Officers Pool”, the words “Lady Officers Pools” shall be substituted.

[F. No. 12033 (4)/76-Pol. II]

का० आ० 2740—राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियमों के नियम 45 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् --

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) चतुर्थ संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में, अनुपूरक नियम 317-ब-20 में, उपनियम (2) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित उपनियम अन्तर्स्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :-

“(2क) इन नियमों में किसी बात के होते हुए भी,

(क) कोई अधिकारी, जिसके या जिसके कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य के स्वाभिवाधीन कोई मकान है, उसे आवंटित निवास स्थान या उससे अनुलग्न उपगृहों, गराजों या भस्तरियों में से किसी का किसी भी व्यक्ति के साथ सहयोग नहीं करेगा या उसे शिकमी नहीं देगा;

(ख) कोई अधिकारी उसे आवंटित निवास स्थान या उससे अनुलग्न उपगृहों, गराजों या भस्तरियों में से किसी का ऐसे व्यक्ति के साथ, जिसके या जिसके कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य के स्वाभिवाधीन कोई मकान है, सहयोग नहीं करेगा या उसे शिकमी नहीं देगा।

स्पष्टीकरण :- इस उपनियम में “मकान” का वही अर्थ है, जो अनुपूरक नियम 317-ब-3 में दिया गया है।”

[फा० स० 12033(8)/76-नीति III]

सुकुमार चौधरी, संयुक्त सचिव

S.O. 2740.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules, further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, in Supplementary Rule 317-B-20, after sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely :—

“(2A) Notwithstanding anything contained in these rules,—

(a) no officer, who or any member of whose family owns a house, shall share with or sublet to, any person the residence allotted to him or any of the out-houses, garages or stables appurtenant thereto;

(b) no officer shall share with, or sublet to, any person who or any member of whose family owns a house, the residence allotted to such officer or any of the out-houses, garages or stables appurtenant thereto.

EXPLANATION: In this sub-rule “house” shall have the same meaning as in Supplementary Rule 317-B-3”.

[F. No. 12033 (8)/76-Pol.III]

S. CHAUDHURY, Joint Secy.